



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**THE CONTOURS AND FUNCTIONS OF DANIELIC
REFERENCES IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK**

JONATHAN W. LO

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
NEW TESTAMENT & CHRISTIAN ORIGINS**

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

2012

ABSTRACT

While scholars generally acknowledge the influence of the book of Daniel in various *loci* in the Gospel of Mark, there has yet to be a systematic study that combines these references to determine their cumulative effect. Previous examinations of Mark's use of Daniel have been piece-meal, exploring a particular Danielic theme or looking at a particular Markan text. Other studies focus on determining whether a certain Markan text contains a reference to Daniel. These studies serve to illuminate Mark's use of Daniel considerably, but leave many important questions unanswered. What is Mark's *modus operandi* in referencing the book of Daniel in particular? What is the shape—the contours and distribution—of Danielic usage in Mark? What can the references together, *in toto*, reveal about Mark's usage of Daniel? This dissertation will explore these questions and clarify Mark's use of Daniel through careful analysis and exegetical study of ten verses with suggested Danielic references (Mark 1:15; 4:11, 32; 9:3; 13:7,13-14, 19, 26; 14:62) so as to observe Mark's overall pattern of usage.

This dissertation will survey the issues surrounding Mark's usage of Daniel and review the secondary literature related the use of the Old Testament in Mark—more specifically the use of Daniel in Mark (Ch. 1). A survey of the use of Daniel in early Jewish literature demonstrates the popularity and the widespread use of Daniel across different Jewish groups—and therefore its availability to Mark (Ch. 2). This survey also provides the cultural and theological background in which to understand Mark's use of Daniel. Each reference to the book of Daniel in the Gospel of Mark, which is noted by the editors of the United Bible Societies *Greek New Testament* (4th ed.) and the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th ed.), will be examined in order to trace the contours of Mark's usage of Daniel, explore the nature of the literary relationship, and determine the literary function of each reference (Ch. 3). The characteristics and patterns that can be observed when the Danielic references in Mark are seen side by side will be closely examined (Ch. 4).

The book of Daniel is found to be even more significant for Mark than it has been acknowledged because Mark's concept of the kingdom of God is profoundly influenced by the visions of God's kingdom in Dan 7 and Dan 2. The influence of the Danielic notion of the kingdom of God permeates Mark's gospel, from Jesus' introductory proclamation in Mark 1:15 to his parables about the kingdom of God in Mark 4, his apocalyptic discourse in Mark 13, and finally his passion in Mark 14. In addition to the kingdom of God, several themes and images in Mark's view of eschatology are also influenced by the Danielic text. Consequently, by looking at the Danielic references in Mark *in toto*, it can be seen that Mark draws upon Daniel primarily for inspiration pertaining to the kingdom of God and its eschatological significance. It is clear that many parts of the book of Daniel were familiar to Mark, and that they played an integral part in shaping his portrayal of the good news of Jesus.

DECLARATION

I DECLARE THE FOLLOWING:

(A) THE THESIS HAS BEEN COMPOSED BY MYSELF;

(B) THE WORK IS MY OWN;

(C) THE WORK HAS NOT BEEN SUBMITTED FOR ANY OTHER DEGREE
OR PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION.



JONATHAN W. LO
PHD CANDIDATE

DATE: 2/26/2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor L. W. Hurtado, for his guidance and care for me throughout the duration of my long years of study at New College. I am grateful to him for his keen insight and scholarly acumen, but especially for his ὑπομονή with regard to my progress and struggles. My term of study at Edinburgh is finally at an end, but I know I will continue to learn from Professor Hurtado.

I would also like to thank Professor Rikki E. Watts, whose passion for the Bible and whose instruction with regard to exegesis have not only been the inspiration for my own study, but have sustained me and served me well, long past my days as a student at Regent College.

I would like to thank Dr Carver Yu, Dr Luke Cheung, and my fellow colleagues at the China Graduate School of Theology in Hong Kong. Thank you for the opportunity to work with you, and for the accommodations you made to allow me to finish this thesis.

I would like to thank my parents, Rev. Raymond & Clara Lo, who have patiently waited for me to finish my studies, and have generously supported me from the beginning of my theological education. Thank you for your encouragement and unfailing love.

I would also like to thank Pastor Bradley Chu and Joanne Yeo, Benny and Catherine Chu, as well as Aaron and Lucy Sherwood for their encouragement and friendship during my sojourn in the UK.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Stephanie Studzinski, who has provided me with endless encouragement, and has also assisted me with the tedious task of editing this manuscript. She has never stopped believing in me, and on the many days I wanted to give up, it was her love that kept me going. She has also had to endure the un-pleasantries of sharing her newly-wed husband with a thesis that demanded so much of his time. Thank you for everything, Stephanie, I would not and could not have done this without you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	13
1.3. RESEARCH CONTEXT.....	15
1.3.1. THE OLD TESTAMENT IN MARK.....	15
1.3.2. THE USE OF DANIEL IN MARK.....	26
1.3.3. SUMMARY.....	36
1.4. RESEARCH METHOD.....	37
1.5. RESEARCH DATA.....	39
1.6. RESEARCH ASSUMPTIONS & DEFINITIONS.....	43

CHAPTER 2—THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN EARLY JEWISH LITERATURE

2.1. INTRODUCTION.....	47
2.2. SURVEY OF THE USE OF DANIEL IN EARLY JEWISH LITERATURE.....	49
2.2.1. <i>Sibylline Oracle 3</i>	49
2.2.2. 1 Maccabees.....	52
2.2.3. 3 Maccabees.....	59
2.2.4. 4 Maccabees.....	63
2.2.5. 4 Ezra.....	71
2.2.6. <i>Similitudes</i> of Enoch.....	80
2.2.7. <i>2 Baruch</i>	87
2.2.8. Texts from Qumran.....	91
2.2.9. Josephus' <i>Jewish Antiquities</i>	102
2.3. OBSERVATIONS.....	104
2.3.1. The Widespread use of Daniel in Early Jewish Literature.....	106
2.3.2. The Authoritative Status of Daniel in Early Jewish Literature.....	107
2.3.3. Continuity, Discontinuity, and Ingenuity.....	108

CHAPTER 3—DANIELIC REFERENCES IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	111
3.1.1. Method.....	116
3.1.2. Frequency and Distribution.....	118

3.2. DANIELIC REFERENCES IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK.....	119
3.2.1. References in Mark 1.....	119
3.2.1.1. Mark 1:15 / Dan 7:22.....	119
3.2.2. References in Mark 4.....	143
3.2.2.1. Mark 4:11 / Dan 2:27-28, 47.....	143
3.2.2.2. Mark 4:32 / Dan 4:12, 21.....	159
3.2.3. References in Mark 9.....	172
3.2.3.1. Mark 9:3 / Dan 7:9.....	172
3.2.4. References in Mark 13.....	180
3.2.4.1. Mark 13:7 / Dan 2: 28-29, 45.....	184
3.2.4.2. Mark 13:13 / Dan 12:12.....	190
3.2.4.3. Mark 13:14 / Dan 12:11; 11:31; 9:27.....	196
3.2.4.4. Mark 13:19 / Dan 12:1.....	202
3.2.4.5. Mark 13:26 / Dan 7:13-14.....	208
3.2.5. References in Mark 14.....	227
3.2.5.1. Mark 14:62 / Dan 7:13.....	227
3.2.6. Other Possible References.....	235
3.2.6.1. Mark 8:38 / Dan 7:13.....	235
3.2.6.2. Mark 14:58 / Dan 2:34, 45.....	236
3.3. SUMMARY.....	238

CHAPTER 4—THE CONTOURS AND FUNCTIONS OF DANIELIC REFERENCES IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	241
4.2. A COMPARISON BETWEEN MARK’S USE OF DANIEL WITH OTHER EARLY JEWISH WRITERS.....	241
4.3. THE OVERALL CONTOURS AND FUNCTIONS OF DANIELIC REFERENCES IN MARK.....	247
4.3.1. The Overall Contours of Markran Use of Daniel.....	247
4.3.1.1. Danielic References in Mark 13.....	248
4.3.1.2. Danielic References Beyond Mark 13.....	252
4.3.2. The Overall Functions of Markan Use of Daniel.....	262
4.3.2.1. Danielic References in Mark 13.....	266
4.3.2.2. Danielic References Beyond Mark 13.....	267
4.4. CONCLUSION.....	268
4.5. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY.....	271

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LEXICAL RESOURCES.....	273
PRIMARY SOURCES.....	273
SECONDARY SOURCES.....	274

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Danielic References Identified by the NA27 and UBS4 Editors.....	40
Figure 2: The Frequency and Distribution of Danielic References in Mark.....	41
Figure 3: Markan Narrative Settings of Danielic References.....	42
Figure 4: The Correspondence Between Dan 11 and 1 Macc 1.....	54
Figure 5: The Frequency and Distribution of Danielic References in Mark.....	119
Figure 6: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 1:15 and Dan 7:22.....	130
Figure 7: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 4:11 and Dan 2:27-28, 47.....	148
Figure 8: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 4:32 and Dan 4:12, 21.....	162
Figure 9: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 9:3 and Dan 7:9.....	176
Figure 10: An Outline of the Subject Matter of the Apocalyptic Discourse.....	181
Figure 11: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:7 and Dan 2:28-29, 45.....	184
Figure 12: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:13 and Dan 12:12.....	192
Figure 13: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:13 and Dan 12:12.....	198
Figure 14: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:19 and Dan 12:1.....	203
Figure 15: A Comparison of the Grammar of MT and Θ at Dan 12:1.....	205
Figure 16: The Threefold Apocalyptic Elements of Mark 13:24-27.....	209
Figure 17: A Comparison of the Parallels of Mark 13:26 and Matt 24:30.....	211
Figure 18: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:26 and Dan 7:13-14.....	214
Figure 19: A Comparison of LXX and Θ at Dan 7:14.....	217
Figure 20: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 14:62, 13:26 and Dan 7:13.....	231
Figure 21: A Summary of the Findings of Chapter 3 of the Thesis.....	240

CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Although many scholars have explored the influence of various aspects of Danielic ideas on specific New Testament theology and themes, little attention has been given to the cumulative effect of a specific New Testament author's use of Daniel.¹ In an article entitled "The Kingdom of God", D. Wenham comments that "[s]cholars have noted different echoes of Daniel in various strands of New Testament teaching, but they have not put the different pieces together and appreciated what they all add up to."² While Wenham may have envisioned something broader in scope—an enrichment of one's understanding of the New Testament through analysing Danielic references to discern their cumulative effect—such a task proves difficult when one considers that allusions and echoes to Daniel can be found throughout the New Testament and across a myriad of genres and authors. It would be a mistake to disregard the singularities of the New Testament authors and assume that these

¹ With the notable exception of G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, M.D.: University Press, 1984), commentators focus on the use of the Old Testament in a certain biblical text more generally, or explore specific themes (such as Christology) in light of the Old Testament, i.e. J. Marcus, *The Way of the Lord. Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992); R. D. Rowe, *God's Kingdom and God's Son. The Background to Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); and R. E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997).

² D. Wenham, "The Kingdom of God and Daniel," *Expository Times* 98 (1987): 132.

different writers interpreted and used Daniel in the same manner.¹ On the other hand, it would also be unwise to leave questions regarding Daniel's relationship to the New Testament unexplored. Many of the themes of the book of Daniel are relevant for understanding the most central concepts of the New Testament. Particularly in the Gospels, scholars have explored the possibility that some Danielic concepts such as the "one like a son of man" (Dan 7:13), the kingdom of God (Dan 2:44; 4:3, 34; 6:26; 7:14, 18, 27, etc.), the Ancient of Days (Dan 7:9), the abomination of desolations (Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11), resurrection and eternal life (Dan 12:2), and even the term 'mystery' (Dan 2 and 4) may have contributed to important aspects of early Christian thought.² Concerning the influence of Dan 7 and the Danielic Son of Man tradition, J. Dunn writes,

The issue is the extent to which and way in which this figure has influenced the portrayal of Jesus in the NT. As we shall see, there is no question about the fact of influence. The controversy is over how and when that influence came to bear on the NT texts; and in particular, whether that influence can be traced as far back as Jesus himself...³

Although the provenance of the phrase and figure of the "Son of Man" in the New Testament is a complex and disputed topic, the "one like a son of man" figure in Dan

¹ Stanley Porter advises against such generalizing, claiming that "it appears that many are trying to create a solid base for a comprehensive analysis of the use of the Old Testament in one of the corpora of the New Testament... It is doubtful that such a picture can be created... Nevertheless, this does not preclude analysis of smaller units, even as portions of the total picture of the use of the Old Testament in the New, but one must not think that the smaller pictures approximate the whole." S. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 93-94.

² A. Y. Collins, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," in *Daniel*, ed. John J. Collins, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); J.D. G. Dunn, "The Danielic Son of Man in the New Testament," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 528-49; C. A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception*, vol. 2, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 490-527; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972); J. Marcus, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986).

³ Dunn, "The Danielic Son of Man in the New Testament," 528.

7 remains a viable candidate.⁴ And while the theme of the kingdom of God can also be found in many other texts in the Hebrew Bible, C. Evans has recently rekindled the suggestion that the term has a Danielic influence in its deployment in the New Testament.⁵ Likewise, the “abomination of desolations”, the *topos* of eternal life, resurrection, and ‘mystery’ have direct parallels in the New Testament.⁶ In light of these salient, albeit hypothetical, points of intersection with Daniel, one is tempted to ask whether the content and theology of the book of Daniel may have played a larger role in the composition of the Gospels than has been previously acknowledged. J. Marcus observes that citations of Old Testament texts in Mark “occupy positions of extraordinary prominence”.⁷ Given the significant terrain of the Gospels (not in mass, but in the strategic location) in which Danielic references have been observed,⁸ a fuller study of the way in which Daniel is employed within the composition of the Gospels will provide fresh insight into the aims of the evangelists, as well as the ideological and theological currency which they employ.

One systematic approach, and the approach of this study, is to explore connections to Danielic references in one New Testament work at a time. As a starting point to such an exploration of the Gospels, the focus of the present investigation will be the use of Daniel in the Gospel of Mark. Mark was chosen as

⁴ So, Ibid.; M. D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (London: SPCK, 1967); C. F. D. Moule, *The Origins of Christology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977). Pace M. Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979); B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1983). See also a fuller survey in Collins, “The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament,” 90-104 and the more recent discussion of M. Müller, *The Expression ‘Son of Man’ and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation* (London; Oakville: Equinox Publishing, 2008).

⁵ I.e. Evans, “Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God’s Kingdom.”

⁶ E.g. The abomination of desolations (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως) of Dan 11:31 is mentioned in both Matt 24:15 and Mark 13:14.

⁷ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, p. 1.

⁸ In tracing the contours of the Danielic references in Mark in ch. 3 of this dissertation, it will be seen that Danielic references appear at the beginning, middle, and end of the Markan Jesus’ ministry.

the focus of this study for several reasons. Mark is the shortest of the canonical Gospels and thus allows for a sufficient analysis and discussion that can involve all the relevant data in Mark and still fit within the confines of a PhD dissertation. Contemporary scholarly consensus holds Mark and Q (whether as a written source, an oral source, or a combination thereof) to be composed earlier than the rest of the canonical Gospels, and also used as literary sources by the other evangelists.⁹ This being the case, Markan material that appears in the other Gospels becomes an invaluable source of information for the present study. Precisely in those places where the canonical evangelists are relying on and redacting Mark's material, a glimpse of the earliest Christian interpretations of Mark's Gospel is revealed. For example, when Mark¹⁰ alludes to the 'desolating sacrilege' in Mark 13:14,¹¹ Matthew recognizes that the allusion is from Daniel and acknowledges Daniel in his own text in Matt 24:15: "So when you see the desolating sacrilege standing in the holy place, as was spoken of *by the prophet Daniel*..."¹² What is merely implied in Mark is made explicit in Matthew's interpretation of Mark's text. This kind of phenomenon becomes more apparent when comparing Synoptic parallels with one another; this technique has been used by redaction-critics to determine the particular emphases of the evangelists making the literary changes.¹³

⁹ For a fuller discussion of the recent consensus on Mark and Q, and the literary relationship between Mark and the other Synoptic gospels, see M. E. Boring, *Mark. A Commentary* (Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 9-15.

¹⁰ For the sake of simplicity, "Mark" will be used throughout to refer to the evangelist of the Second Gospel. While I prefer to remain agnostic regarding the identity of the author of the Gospel of Mark, the issue remains outside of the scope of this dissertation.

¹¹ Unless otherwise noted, English translations from the New Testament are taken from the NRSV.

¹² Emphasis mine.

¹³ A. Suhl's study of the Old Testament in Mark reflects such a *Redaktionsgeschichte* approach, but is content to downplay Mark's usage simply because his style does not follow the criteria—as defined by Matthew and Luke's style of usage—where citations are obvious and clearly demarcated. Furthermore, since he holds that Mark inherits traditions that already have Old Testament images and references imbedded in them, their presence is insignificant for Mark. Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* ([Gütersloher]: Gütersloher

However, it can be seen that these types of changes not only reveal the redactor's authorial intentions and tendencies, but also his reception and interpretation of the source material. The redactor's changes can be a window into the source-text, particularly its reception and its effect upon contemporary readers who share a similar *Weltanschauung*.¹⁴ James Barr, articulating the view of many scholars, notes that "[t]he Old Testament prepared a matrix of language and imagery, some about the past, some about a future to come, some about the present and its problems; and this language was taken up, reused and revitalized for the expression of the religious realities of Christianity..."¹⁵ Larry Hurtado expresses a similar sentiment with regards to Mark's use of the Old Testament in particular:

Mark links the story of Jesus with a larger 'narrative world' of scriptural (Old Testament) prophecy and personages, and also with the early Christian proclamation of the gospel in the circles for which he wrote...the Old Testament functions very importantly in shaping and expressing their 'life world' of religious vocabulary, symbols, and fundamental beliefs.¹⁶

Therefore, a study of Synoptic changes to Mark can be important for understanding both the ways in which the text of Daniel is received by Mark's earliest interpreters, as well as the ideological background behind the composition of the Gospels.

Mark's use of the Old Testament is unique among the gospels, in that apart from the direct speeches of Jesus, there is only one explicit citation of the Old Testament by the Markan narrator, which is found in Mark 1:2: "*As it is written in*

Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1965). See also Evans' critique of Suhl, in Craig A. Evans, "The Beginning of the Good News and the Fulfillment of Scripture in the Gospel of Mark," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids ; Cambridge, UK: William B Eerdmans, 2006), 83-84.

¹⁴ Like Mark, the other Synoptic evangelists have a penchant for using the Old Testament in their narrative about Jesus, albeit in different ways. See C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952), 133.

¹⁵ J. Barr, *Escaping from Fundamentalism* (London: SCM, 1984), 105.

¹⁶ L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ. Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 306-7, 308.

*the prophet Isaiah*¹⁷, ‘See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way’”. The explicit promise-fulfilment frequently observed in Matthew and Luke is largely absent in Mark. In fact, although Jesus clearly quotes from the Old Testament on a number of occasions,¹⁸ there are only two places where the source-text is clearly identified. In Mark 7:6, the Markan Jesus explicitly mentions the name of the prophet Isaiah in connection with the citation and the name David in connection with Psalm 110 in Mark 12:35-37. Other citations are marked by the citation formula γέγραπται followed by the quotation, but do not identify the source.¹⁹ A ‘quotation marker’ can be either a formal citation-formula (such as γέγραπται, καθώς γέγραπται, ὡς γέγραπται, etc) or an identification of the source text or author (ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφῆτῃ, αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ [referring to the Psalms], ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου [referring to the Law (Exod. 13:2)], etc)²⁰. In either case, through the use of the quotation marker, the authors inform the readers that the material they are reading comes from some other source.²¹

However, apart from these examples, Mark’s use of the Old Testament is largely un-marked and not explicitly introduced. Hurtado suggests that the non-explicit citations and allusions “combine to constitute an account of Jesus that is heavily shaped by the Old Testament, and [were] prepared for readers who regard the

¹⁷ Emphasis mine.

¹⁸ Other quotations of the Old Testament also employ the γέγραπται formula, but do not mention where the Scripture cited is from. Mark 11:17; 14:27.

¹⁹ Mark 11:17; 14:27.

²⁰ Mark 1:2; 12:36; Lk 2:23.

²¹ The differentiation being made here, is that a ‘quotation’ is when the reader is intentionally informed that a citation is taking place through what are referred to as quotation markers. Allusions are references that are imbedded into the writer’s text without any formal markers indicating that a reference is being made. Regardless, the reader is expected to recognize the quoted and alluded material.

Old Testament as Scripture.”²² As recent research has argued, Mark’s literary and compositional technique has often been overlooked, and his use of the Old Testament may well be a feature of Markan style that has been downplayed. Concerning Mark, Evans writes that the “evangelist’s adoption of Old Testament motifs that function as backdrops to the ministry of Jesus reveals more sophistication than some interpreters have allowed.”²³ J. C. Anderson and S. D. Moore agree that the juxtaposition of intertextual echoes is one of Mark’s favourite rhetorical devices.²⁴ In light of Mark’s subtlety in his usage of the Old Testament, one is resigned to venture past the territory of direct quotations into the elusive realm of allusions and echoes.

In an essay on the methodology of the study of the Old Testament in the New Testament, S. Porter addresses the subjectivity involved in discerning allusions to the Old Testament and laments the general lack of precision in the definition of terms in this field.²⁵ Scholars on the subject do not always give clear indications as to what they mean by ‘quotations’, ‘allusions’, or ‘echoes’ in their own work, and there are often disagreements regarding what should constitute a ‘citation’ and what should be classified as an ‘allusion’. For instance, C. Stanley, R. Hays, and M. Silva, who have all written extensively on the topic, hold to a restrictive standard of what should be considered a ‘quotation’, saying that it must be marked by a citation formula.²⁶ There is nothing wrong with defining a quotation this way, except, as Porter protests, the

²² Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 307-8.

²³ Craig A. Evans, "How Mark Writes," in *The Written Gospel*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 147.

²⁴ Janice Capel Anderson, Stephen D. Moore, eds. *Mark & Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 40.

²⁵ Porter is referring to citations and allusions in the Pauline Corpus, but the principles also apply to the Gospels.

²⁶ See Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," 92; also M. Silva, "Old Testament in Paul," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne and R. P. Martin (Downers Grove, Inter-varsity Press, 1993), 631-634.

categories are not only heuristic, but also interpretative. That is, the terminology is not only used to classify different types of Old Testament usage, but also to assign greater or lesser degrees of significance to the different types of usage. Porter writes, "Passages with explicit quotations still have priority in the discussion. But is this correct? Several reasons indicate that in order to offer a complete assessment of the use of the Old Testament and related texts in the New Testament, one must consider all the available evidence."²⁷ Citing evidence from citation practices from Qumran, H. C. Kee, who is similarly critical of A. Suhl's study of the use of the Old Testament in Mark, contends that "to limit the investigation to those places where there are explicit and extended quotations from known texts, as *Suhl* [sic] proposes, is not only arbitrary but inadequate for tracing the fuller hermeneutical picture."²⁸ There seems to be a consensus that Old Testament allusions, regardless of whether they are demarcated by formal markers, are crucial to the understanding of the texts in which they occur. Amidst this confusion, one way forward is to define clearly what one means by the terms 'citation' and 'allusion' and to develop a set of criteria that describe the process by which one classifies a certain reference. However, G. K. Beale, in his study of the use of Daniel in the book of Revelation notes the difficulty in determining whether an author "(1) is consciously alluding to an O.T. text, (2) is making an unconscious reference via his 'learned past', (3) is merely using stock apocalyptic phraseology, or (4)...[is] referring to an actual experience which has parallels with an O.T. text."²⁹ Beale's observation suggests that the problem is greater than the classification of references to a particular text because in addition to

²⁷ Porter, *Use of the Old Testament*, 89.

²⁸ H. C. Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," in *Jesus and Paulus*, ed. E. Earle Ellis and E. Grässer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 166.

²⁹ Beale, *Revelation*, 306.

determining the strength of an allusion, there is also the question of whether the author intends for his audience to recognize it. Beale suggests that regardless of whether the reference to the Old Testament text is a citation, allusion, or echo, the author can be employing it in any various ways. For this reason, it may not be enough to set up criteria for classifying a particular reference. The contours and functions of the particular references, as well as comparisons with other potential source-texts, need to be closely examined first. In doing so, the data and the process behind the decision-making are transparent—even if there is disagreement regarding terminology or nomenclature. Ideally there can still be discussions and debates about the process in addition to discussions of whether the actual arguments set forth are compelling or whether the data have been handled fairly and competently, etc. None of the Danielic references identified in this dissertation are what C. Stanley *et al* would consider citations; they are not marked by a citation formula nor are they explicitly introduced. They all fall into the category of non-explicit citations, allusions, and echoes. However, the present study will not endeavour to convince the reader whether a particular verse is a citation or allusion, because for the present study, the labels are irrelevant. Literary data concerning the contours and functions of potential Danielic connections to Mark will be provided but no differentiation will be made. The term “reference” will be used in a general sense of intertextual usage and defined as the action of mentioning or alluding to something. Therefore, the term reference will be used broadly to include citations, allusions, and echoes. The criteria for the validity of what constitutes a reference will be discussed in greater detail in below.

The criteria for what constitutes intertextual usage that is used in this study are influenced by M. Thompson's literary criteria in his monograph on Rom 12, by B. Rosner's study on Paul and Scripture in 1 Corinthians 5-7, by R. Watts' criteria in *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, by G. K. Beale's study of Daniel in Revelation, and by S. Porter's suggestions in his essay on methodology.³⁰ There is a full spectrum of intertextual usage in Mark: A) explicit quotations (complete with citation-formula (γέγραπται) and an identification of the referenced author or text),³¹ B) quotations of known texts that are introduced by a citation-formula but do not identify the source of the reference,³² C) quotations that are not introduced by a citation formula, but do nonetheless identify the source of the reference,³³ D) quotations of a known text that are neither introduced by a citation-formula nor identified as to the source of the reference,³⁴ E) allusions to piecemeal content (phrases, and in some cases, just vocabulary) particular to some other source,³⁵ and finally F) identifiable conceptual parallels (employing little or no shared vocabulary and literary structure) borrowed from another source.³⁶ The Danielic references in Mark studied in this dissertation all fall under the categories of D, E, and F which describe more tenuous forms of

³⁰ Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," 95, M. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13*, vol. 59, *JSNTsup* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 29-32; B. S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7*, (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 19; Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, 8., Beale, *Revelation*, 307-311. See also R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture* (New Haven/London: Yale, 1989); C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 74; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

³¹ I.e. Mark 1:2; 7:6.

³² I.e. Mark 11:17; 14:27.

³³ I.e. Mark 12:36. A quotation of Psalm 110 is attributed to David.

³⁴ I.e. Mark 13:26; 14:62.

³⁵ I.e. The 'desolating sacrilege' in Mark 13:14.

³⁶ Watts, in *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, maintains that there is a thorough-going Old Testament motif of the Isaianic New Exodus in Mark, and Marcus, argues that Jesus' journey to Jerusalem in Mark is portrayed so as to evoke the Deutero-Isaianic 'Way of the Lord'. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, 370-374; Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, 68. This last category of conceptual parallels is most difficult to isolate and identify; however, the work of Watts and Marcus have largely been well-received in the scholarly community. See Evans, "How Mark Writes," 135-148.

intertextual usage. While one may assume that the more explicit references have greater significance than those less explicit, this is often not necessarily the case. Only several of Mark's Old Testament references are introduced with a citation formula; instead, Mark depends much more heavily on the non-explicit use of scripture.

The present study relies on S. Porter's definition of an 'allusion' as "the nonformal invocation by an author of a text (or person, event, etc.) that the author could reasonably be expected to know."³⁷ To be sure, this is an extensive category because it contains a whole spectrum of explicit allusions, oblique allusions, and everything that falls in between, including echoes. The explicitness of an allusion will depend on the extent of the parallelism between the material appropriated and the source material. Allusions that share close linguistic and conceptual parallels with the source material are easiest to discern. These allusions maintain considerable verbal agreement with the source text, i.e. a greater number of shared words, and remain the most convincing instances of allusive activity. However, there are also instances where the source material is paraphrased using a different vocabulary and where only a conceptual parallel can be observed. In these cases, the allusion is more oblique, making the textual inter-relationship more tenuous and speculative. Accordingly, these allusions should be treated with caution. For greater transparency, the following is a set of criteria that has been used to determine the validity of all potential intertextual usage within the present study. Mark's intertextual usage of a certain text is likely when:

³⁷ Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," 95.

- a) There is a likelihood that the source-text is accessible and known by Mark. This can often be demonstrated by showing a similar application of the Old Testament source passage elsewhere (i.e., Qumran, Pseudepigrapha, Targums, Josephus, etc).
- b) There is the likelihood that the alluded material is not from another source. This can be demonstrated by comparing the alluded material with other potential sources to gauge their lexical, grammatical, conceptual similarities with the Markan text. If it cannot be demonstrated that one text is more likely to be the source-text than the others, it may be that the Mark is depending on a common tradition rather than any one text.
- c) There are lexical, grammatical, or conceptual parallels that are unique to the proposed source-text. The higher the number of parallels with the proposed text, the greater the likelihood that it is the source of the reference. The three types of parallels (lexical, grammatical, and conceptual) may not all be present in a given text, however, the presence of more than one type of parallel significantly increases the likelihood of literary dependence.
- d) The same type of reference appears among a cluster of other clearer allusions to the Old Testament context in question. When this can be demonstrated, the probability that there is an allusion present increases.³⁸
- e) Other evangelists depending on Mark recognize a particular Old Testament allusion in Mark. The evidence that an allusion exists in the text is especially compelling when it can be shown that even Mark's earliest interpreters recognized it as such.

³⁸ Taken from Beale, *Revelation*, 307.

Ultimately, the goal of this study is not a search for allusions, but rather a study of the extent and the nature of Mark's usage of Daniel in texts where the allusions are recognized and therefore, less controversial. The textual data of the present study will be the Markan texts that have been identified by the editors of the NA27 and UBS4 Greek texts to contain Danielic references. The contribution of the present work to the existing debate is the study of the pattern and function of the references to Daniel, both individually and cumulatively, and how this informs one's understanding of Mark's use of Daniel to convey his particular message about Jesus. As others have noted, the influence of Daniel in the New Testament, especially Mark, is undeniable. However, what is the extent and shape of that influence? What are the contours and functions of Danielic allusions in the Gospel of Mark?

1.2. Research Questions

The present study is an examination and discussion of the Danielic allusions contained in the Gospel of Mark. Two primary questions undergird and define this discussion: What is the form and what are the *contours* of Markan intertextual employment of Daniel? And what is the function of Markan allusions to Daniel, both individually and *in toto*? The first question involves identifying the various allusions to Daniel in Mark and observing their frequency and distribution throughout the Markan text. In other words, with what amount of frequency do Danielic references occur in Markan texts and what patterns, if any, emerge? What is the strength of the literary relationship and what does Mark's use of Daniel look like? What exactly is Mark referring to in Daniel, and how does he reproduce this material in his own gospel? This line of inquiry leads to yet another question: What are the literary and

rhetoical functions of these Danielic references in the text where they are found?³⁹

Literary function is determined by the effect that employing a certain allusion has, or is intended to have, on the particular gospel narrative, which is being read as a literary text. Rhetorical function, which is closely related to literary function, is concerned with the effect the writer is intending to have on the audience. C. Stanley stresses the importance of acknowledging the rhetorical element in the use of Old Testament citations, remarking that “the ancient author quotes a passage from Scripture as part of a broader argument designed to convince others to believe or act in a certain way. This is a *rhetorical* act, and it should be investigated as such.”⁴⁰ However, Mark’s rhetoric is “narrative rhetoric” in that “the implied author persuades the implied reader first to understand and then to share and extend the story’s levels of meaning.”⁴¹ For the present study, Mark’s communication with his audience is examined through written narrative, and accordingly, the effectiveness of his communication will depend on his literary ability. The focus of this dissertation is the literary and rhetorical functions of individual Danielic references in Mark as viewed through their contributions to Mark’s narrative. In addition to the study of the function of individual references to Daniel, the function of the entire constellation of Danielic references will also be explored. Through careful textual analysis, this dissertation will yield valuable insight into how Mark employs Danielic text and thought, and what can be inferred regarding the significance of Daniel for interpreting Mark’s own gospel.

³⁹ Stanley, “The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method,” 45.

⁴⁰ C. D. Stanley, “The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method” in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel. Investigation and Proposals*, ed. C. A. Evans. and J. A. Sanders (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 44.

⁴¹ Anderson *et al.*, *Mark and Method*, 39.

1.3. Research Context

Although the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament has been studied at length by many scholars, this survey of past scholarship will focus on the secondary literature primarily concerned with the use of the Old Testament in Mark, and specifically, the use of Daniel in Mark. Commentaries with notable contributions to the subject matter will be discussed along with other secondary literature if and when appropriate within the body of the dissertation.

1.3.1. The Old Testament in Mark

The use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark is a relatively young field of study.⁴² Studies on Mark's use of the Old Testament have focused on his literary technique,⁴³ his view of the Law,⁴⁴ the impact of Old Testament *Heilsgeschichte*,⁴⁵ the influence of Jewish and Christian religious observances,⁴⁶ and his attitude regarding fulfilment.⁴⁷

⁴² The present discussion of research on Mark's use of the Old Testament will begin with the work of S. Schulz, "Markus und das Alte Testament," *ZTK* 58 (1961): 184-97.

⁴³ R. Schneek, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VII*, BDS 1 (Vallejo, CA: BIBAL Press, 1994), W. S. Vorster, "The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark," *NeoT* 14 (1981): 62-72.

⁴⁴ M. D. Hooker, "Mark," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture, Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars Ssf*, ed. D. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 220-30; S. Schulz, "Markus Und Des Alte Testament," 184-97.

⁴⁵ J. D. M. Derrett, *The Making of Mark: The Scriptural Bases of the Earliest Gospel*, 2 vols. (Shipston-on-Stour, England: Drinkwater, 1985); A. M. Farrer, *A Study in Mark* (Westminster: Dacre, 1951); ———, *St. Matthew and St. Mark* (Westminster: Dacre, 1954); O. Piper, "Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New Testament," *Int* 11 (1957): 3-22; W. Roth, *Hebrew Gospel: Cracking the Code of Mark* (Oak Park, IL: Meyer-Stone, 1988); W. M. Swartley, "The Structural Function of the Term 'Way' (Hodos) in Mark's Gospel," in *The New Way of Jesus: Essays Presented to Howard Charles*, ed. W. Klassen (Kansas: Faith and Life Press, 1980), 73-86.

⁴⁶ J. Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah*, vol. 8, Spb (Leiden: Brill, 1965); P. Carrington, *Primitive Christian Calendar: A Study in the Making of the Marcan Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952); M. D. Goulder, *The Evangelists Calendar* (London: SPCK, 1978).

⁴⁷ H. Anderson, "The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in the Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, ed. J. M. Efird (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972), 280-306; Schneek, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VII*, Vorster, "The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark," 62-72.

S. Schulz's study of Mark's use of the Old Testament is based on the idea that Mark is meant to be read in the light of Phil 2:8, which is a text Schulz regards as more important for Gentile Christianity than for Palestinian Christianity. According to Schulz, any mention of Jesus' teachings and deeds in Mark is for the sake of justifying Mark's kerygmatic presentation of Jesus.⁴⁸ For example, Mark's Jesus rejects Israel's *Heilsgeschichte*, because from the perspective of Gentile Christianity (in Schulz's estimation), the Law no longer has any positive function because Christ is the culmination of the Law. Though Schulz's study draws attention to the use of the Old Testament in Mark, his conclusions are based upon a controversial assumption of a pre-Pauline Hellenistic Christianity that many scholars find dubious, especially in light of recent research that the Markan Jesus probably fully accepted and obeyed the Jewish Law.⁴⁹

A. Suhl's seminal work *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* in 1965 was the first monograph devoted to answering the question of how Mark uses the Old Testament.⁵⁰ Suhl uses a redaction-critical approach on explicit and extended Old Testament quotations and makes the conclusion that although Mark makes use of the Old Testament, it is not for the purpose of fulfilment. Mark's citations have little to do with a context within the Old Testament or a promise and fulfilment schema, but merely function as *Schriftgemäß*, demonstrating that the story of Jesus happens κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, in a general sense.⁵¹ Suhl's thesis is based on the assumption that Mark is operating under the expectation of an imminent parousia, and therefore, is not concerned with history,

⁴⁸ Schulz, "Markus und das Alte Testament," 184-97.

⁴⁹ J. G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel. Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 82-97, 208.

⁵⁰ Suhl, *Die Funktion der Alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 157ff.

and certainly not *Heilsgeschichte*. Suhl insists that Mark merely cites the Old Testament to demonstrate that the history of Jesus is consistent with the scriptures of Israel, in a similar sense to that of Paul's use of κατὰ τὰς γραφάς in 1 Cor 15:3, in which he does not actually specify any particular Old Testament promise.⁵² Furthermore, Suhl's juxtaposition of Mark's use of the Old Testament alongside that of Matthew and Luke, whose use of the Old Testament is much more frequent and deliberate in comparison, leads him to minimize the significance of the Old Testament for Mark. Suhl's study, though inventive in its use of Matthew and Luke to understand Mark, suffers from several limitations. Suhl operates under what many regard as a narrow view of the concept of fulfilment. Those scholars who maintain that there is considerable overlap between 'Anrede' and 'Bericht' find Suhl's presentation unconvincing.⁵³ Suhl leaves no room for discussion by denying the presence of any promise-fulfilment schema altogether. However, the phenomenon that Old Testament texts appear to be strategically placed in significant sections of Mark's narration of Jesus' ministry suggests that perhaps the some of these texts are fulfilled in Jesus in some way.⁵⁴

As H. Kee also notes, Suhl's method of only examining explicit quotations and altogether disregarding allusions prevents him from "tracing the fuller hermeneutical picture".⁵⁵ Porter adds, "Although there is merit in investigating the various types of use of the Old Testament and related texts in the New Testament,

⁵² Ibid., 37-44.

⁵³ See similar criticisms of Suhl by Evans and Watts. Evans, "The Beginning of the Good News and the Fulfillment of Scripture in the Gospel of Mark," 83-86; Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, 16-19.

⁵⁴ Markus, *Way of the Lord*, 3.

⁵⁵ Kee, 173. See also Porter, 79-96. In an article lamenting the lack of precision in scholarly work with regard to defining the terms of quotations, allusions, echoes, Porter also agrees with Kee that only studying 'direct quotations' misses out on the fuller picture of Old Testament usage in the New Testament.

one cannot claim to provide an accurate study of a given New Testament author's use of the Old Testament unless *all* of the types of usage and influence are discussed".⁵⁶ Essentially, Porter affirms Kee's observation that allusions and more oblique references to the Old Testament play an essential role in what the New Testament writer is trying to communicate. The choice to adhere to strict criteria for direct quotations and only consider those that fulfil those criteria arises from the desire to eliminate subjectivity and maintain an impartial study of the text. For example, what appears to be a 'definite allusion' to one person may be dismissed by another; there is a fine line between what results from attentiveness to the text and an over-active imagination. Kee perceives there to be as many as fifty-seven quotations and one hundred and sixty allusions to the Old Testament in Mark 11-16 alone. And out of those staggering number of quotations, twelve quotations and twenty allusions are suggested to have come from Daniel.⁵⁷ The frequency that Kee observes is probably exaggerated, but to simply ignore the allusions and even more oblique references results in an incomplete portrayal of a writer's technique and intentions. Therefore, a useful method will be to examine all references, quotations, allusions and more oblique references in a given text, but to state as clearly as possible the criteria by which one is using to evaluate and establish the strength or validity of any given reference. Thus, allusions and echoes can be included without compromising the integrity of the study and allow for a fuller understanding of the text.

H. Anderson's study in 1972 echoes Suhl's conclusion that Mark was not interested in promise-fulfilment when referencing the Old Testament and affirms that the work of Jesus and John in Mark's Gospel are in keeping with a general

⁵⁶ Porter, 96.

⁵⁷ Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," 171.

expression of the divine will and not “the letter of the Old Testament and its fulfilment”.⁵⁸ However, in examining the Markan prologue and particularly the unity of 1:1-13, Anderson concedes that the Old Testament is relevant to Mark’s portrayal of Jesus, but only in so far as to show that he conforms to Old Testament ideas “concerning the persecution of God’s true servants...through suffering and death to eventual vindication and victory.”⁵⁹ However, such a view does not adequately take into account the contours and the breadth of the Old Testament references in Mark, which go beyond the theme of the suffering and vindication of God’s servants to encompass other themes such as the eschatological herald (Mal 3:1; Isa 40:3), Davidic messianism (Ps 2:7) and the kingdom of God (Dan 7)—all of which are themes with prophetic overtones. Furthermore, Mark’s Passion narrative in Mark 14-16, is replete with references to the Old Testament “to an extent unparalleled in the rest of his narrative”.⁶⁰ Markus suggests that this is because Mark wants to portray the suffering, death, and resurrection of Jesus as fulfilment of scripture.⁶¹ Even the teachings of Jesus are rife with Old Testament citations, allusions, and hints of fulfilment (most notably in the apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13). I. H. Marshall is correct to note that “the main motifs in the Gospel—the kingdom of God and the Messiah—are drawn from Scripture...What takes place in the story is the fulfilment of Scripture and specifically of its prophecies of future redemption through the coming of a messianic figure.”⁶² In light of the data, Anderson’s position that Mark has no interest in fulfilment must be re-evaluated.

⁵⁸ Anderson, "The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel," 286.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 297.

⁶⁰ Markus, *Way of the Lord*, 153.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² I. H. Marshall, *New Testament Theology: Many witnesses, one gospel* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2004), 78.

In H. C. Kee's analysis of Old Testament quotations and allusions in Mark 11—16, he observes that Mark often employs "prophetic and eschatologically interpreted passages of Scripture", and does so at crucial points of developing his argument.⁶³ The Old Testament is for Mark a presupposition, a "necessary link with the biblical tradition that Mark sees redefined and comprehended through Jesus".⁶⁴ It is noteworthy that Kee focuses on Daniel as a primary text that Mark invokes, particularly when addressing the hope of redemption, the suffering motif, and Christology.⁶⁵ However, despite Kee's assertion that the book of Daniel stands behind certain Markan themes, these themes could also have arisen from other Old Testament sources. For example, Kee's insistence on viewing Daniel as the backdrop to the suffering motif in Mark 14—15 fails to recognize the importance and probable influence of the Isaianic Servant Songs.⁶⁶ Be that as it may, Kee's analysis of Old Testament texts in Mark takes into account the apocalyptic character of both Mark and some of the texts employed by Mark. In an essay titled "Apocalypticism as a Bridge Between the Testaments", which concerns the legacy of apocalyptic thought, J. J. Carey writes,

This way of viewing the world, inspired by prophetic calls of judgment and the reward of the righteous, shaped the mentality of the first Christians... Those convictions, magnified by times of persecution, caused much (if not all) of first-century Christianity to live with the hope of the Parousia.⁶⁷

⁶³ Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," 173.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 179.

⁶⁵ With Sundberg, see A. C. Sundberg, "On Testimonies," *NovT* 3 (1959): 268-81.

⁶⁶ Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," 170ff.

⁶⁷ J. J. Carey, "Apocalypticism as Bridge between the Testaments," in *The Old and New Testaments: Their Relationship and The "Intertestamental" Literature*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Walter P. Weaver (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993), 102.

In another work, Kee affirms his own view that Daniel is a dominant source of inspiration for Mark, “The same disproportionate interest in Daniel prevails throughout the book [of Mark] ... Daniel alone among all the Old Testament books is quoted from every chapter; it is of the highest level of significance for the New Testament as a whole as a result of its overwhelming importance for Mark.”⁶⁸ However, Kee’s observation of twenty-one quotations and twenty allusions in Mark⁶⁹ is surely overstated. Without the careful and detailed textual analysis of individual texts it is impossible for Kee to substantiate his ambitious claim. In contrast, the present study will include a detailed analysis of each suggested reference to Daniel so that there can be agreement and engagement with the textual data even if one does not share its conclusions.

D. M. Smith’s survey of the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament includes a discussion of Mark’s use of the Old Testament.⁷⁰ Smith remarks that Mark’s view of the Old Testament is not his own because it “relies on a Christian tradition of Old Testament interpretation.”⁷¹ In particular, the frequency of allusions to the Old Testament in Mark’s passion narrative increases significantly.⁷² Smith attributes this phenomenon to the “very early tradition of the passion, which was deeply influenced by the Old Testament.”⁷³ Smith also notes that, with some exceptions, Mark’s Old Testament quotations are mostly taken from the LXX. In response to Suhl’s attempt to show that Mark’s purpose in quoting the Old

⁶⁸ H. C. Kee, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark’s Gospel* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1977), 45.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ D. M. Smith, Jr., “The Use of the Old Testament in the New,” in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, ed. James M. Efird (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972), 25-30.

⁷¹ Ibid., 40.

⁷² See also Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 153-98.

⁷³ Ibid., 41.

Testament is only to show the *Schriftgemässheit* of events in Jesus' ministry, Smith maintains that Mark's gospel embodies "the more primitive Christian idea that the kerygma as presently announced fulfils the past prophetic scriptures," and that "the primitive references to the Scriptures have no specific Scripture prophecies in view..."⁷⁴ Although Smith generally accepts Suhl's suggestion that Mark's Gospel has a kerygmatic and Hellenistic character, he nonetheless feels that Suhl's position is an "overstatement of a valid insight".⁷⁵ S. Moyise suggests that although Mark does not provide a set of quotations to explain the various aspects of Jesus' life (as Matthew and Luke do), his allusions have a similar function.⁷⁶ Moyise writes that Mark's Gospel has been written in such a way that it evokes the righteous sufferer of the psalms and probably also the suffering servant of Isaiah and the smitten shepherd of Zechariah. He does not try to prove that Jesus is any of these figures. He simply uses them as his 'palette' as he constructs his portrait of Jesus."⁷⁷ Marcus similarly agrees that "Mark uses *precisely Old Testament* texts as a paint box for important sections of his Gospel."⁷⁸ The present dissertation demonstrates that the allusions to Daniel rightfully belong on Mark's 'palette' as a primary colour.

The work of both J. Marcus and R. Watts contributes to the discussion of the usage of the Old Testament in Mark by using the Markan prologue as a key for understanding various allusions and imagery in the rest of the gospel.⁷⁹ Marcus views Isa. 40:3 as the key to Mark's Gospel, which presents Jesus as "leading his people through the wilderness to their true homeland in a mighty demonstration of

⁷⁴ Ibid., 42.

⁷⁵ Ibid. Suhl has been criticized for uncritically adopting the view of W. Marxsen; see Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 2.

⁷⁶ S. Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, The Continuum Biblical Studies Series (New York: Continuum, 2001), 32.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 3.

⁷⁹ I.e. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*; Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*.

saving power.”⁸⁰ Jesus is the fulfilment of Yahweh’s journey through the wilderness to Jerusalem. Jesus’ final journey to Jerusalem, his suffering and death are, according to Marcus, the fulfilment of the prophesied apocalyptic victory of the divine warrior.⁸¹ Marcus takes a topical approach, surveying the Old Testament texts in Mark which relate to his view of Christology. His discussion of Danielic references is restricted to Mark 14:62 in the Passion narrative, which when combined with the references to Zech 9-14, the Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer, and the Deutero-Isaian Servant Songs, provide the Old Testament background of a suffering figure “whose fate is set in an eschatological context and has a collective dimension.”⁸² In Marcus’s study of Mark 14:62, however, he also accepts Mark 13:26 and Mark 8:38 to be allusions to Daniel but does not include them in his discussion of Markan Christology.

R. Watts’ analysis of the Markan prologue also takes into account the reference to Malachi, which contains a message of judgment for those who reject the coming of the Lord and his messenger. The rejection of Jesus by the authorities in Jerusalem, which, according to Watts, culminates with the story of the widow’s offering in the Temple in Mark 12:41-44, signifies certain judgment on Israel as an institution. Watts maintains that Mark illustrates this by placing the story between the two accounts of the fig tree (Mark 11:13 and 11:30) thus signifying the demise of the Temple establishment.⁸³ Watts’ thesis, that Mark uses the schema of the Isaianic New Exodus as a literary and thematic pattern in telling his own story about Jesus⁸⁴ has been challenged by some scholars who maintain that while Watts’ insights into

⁸⁰ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 29.

⁸¹ Ibid., 203.

⁸² Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 196.

⁸³ Watts, *Isaiah’s New Exodus in Mark*, 310-18.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 5.

the connection between Mark and Isaiah are helpful, he perhaps goes too far in proposing an overarching literary schema.⁸⁵

G. K. Beale's study of the use of Daniel in the book of Revelation is highly relevant to the present study. Beale's exploration of Danielic references in Revelation through the lens of the early Jewish use of Daniel reveals that Daniel "is the most formative influence on the thought and structure of Revelation".⁸⁶ Beale concludes that in Revelation the prophecy of the "one like a son of man" in Dan 7 will be fulfilled through suffering and apparent defeat.⁸⁷ The major contribution of Beale to the present study is his thoughtful approach to the study and evaluation of allusions, which has been modified and adapted to examine the use of Daniel in Mark in the present study.⁸⁸ He advises that "rather than studying an allusion or citation in isolation from its context in an apocalyptic work, one should be aware of the possibility of the reference being but part of a larger O.T. pattern which dominates the particular context of the apocalyptic work under consideration."⁸⁹ Further supporting his thesis, Beale's survey of Jewish apocalyptic texts also reveals that some early Jewish writers employ Daniel "in a manner harmonious with the context of Daniel itself".⁹⁰ The insights of Beale are invaluable; the results of the present study are based on the fruit of his insights and research.

One final noteworthy study is R. D. Rowe's study of the use of the Psalms in the gospel of Mark.⁹¹ Rowe's analysis is similar to Marcus' *Way of the Lord* in that he explores the use of the Old Testament in Mark through the lens of a particular

⁸⁵ See also Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 33.

⁸⁶ Beale, *Revelation*, 297.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ See especially, Ibid., 306-7.

⁸⁹ Beale, *Revelation*, 327.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 309.

⁹¹ R. D. Rowe, *God's Kingdom and God's Son*, 3-10.

Markan theme. Whereas Marcus observed Old Testament texts that developed Mark's Christology in general, Rowe examines the element of kingship in Mark's Christology in particular. In addition, while Marcus' study makes use of different Old Testament texts, Rowe limits his focus on the concept of kingship in the Psalms. Rowe argues that Mark's presentation of Jesus as Messiah is based on four Psalms (Pss 2; 118; 110; and 22), which are referenced at least twice by Mark in dramatically significant portions of his narrative.⁹² Moreover, he observed that Mark "linked the concept of Messiahship/divine sonship with the kingdom of God – powerful, ethical, personal, and compassionate – whose coming was 'good news'."⁹³ The significance of the link between the concept of the kingdom of God and the Messiah will be especially relevant to the study of the contours and functions Danielic references in the following discussions. The aim of the present study is similar to the works of Beale, Marcus, and Rowe, which analyze the significance of intertextual usage of Old Testament texts in Mark. The major difference is that unlike Marcus and Rowe, whose studies were undertaken through the lens of a particular theme, the current study will begin with the Danielic references to better understand Mark's use of Daniel, and perhaps the significance of Daniel for Mark's narrative. In this regard, the present study most resembles Beale's work on the use of Daniel in Revelation. However, to maximise agreement with the data, if not the results, this study has chosen to use texts that are already acknowledged to contain references by the NA27 and UBS4 editors as a starting point for ascertaining the contours and functions of Mark's use of Daniel.

⁹² Rowe, *Kingdom*, 304.

⁹³ Ibid., 307.

1.3.2. The Use of Daniel in Mark

As discussed above, Kee explores the influence of Daniel on the Markan Passion narrative, but apart from his study, substantive scholarship has not been devoted to the use of Daniel in Mark as a whole.⁹⁴ However, some recent contributions have been made in this area and the following is a brief survey of these studies.

D. Wenham suggests that Daniel is the primary background for the New Testament conception of the Kingdom of God.⁹⁵ He looks to both Daniel 2 and 7 as passages that are potentially influential for the kingdom of God in the New Testament. Wenham also remarks that “not only does Daniel provide a linguistic background for the New Testament phrase” but it also “provides...a good conceptual background.”⁹⁶ Wenham sees “a strong case for understanding, in particular, the Gospels’ teaching of the kingdom of God in the context of the Jewish eschatological hope for a new age and for God’s restoration of his people Israel.”⁹⁷ Wenham’s confidence in the matter is bolstered by his opinion that some other New Testament concepts (i.e., Son of Man, the desolating sacrilege, etc) have “unambiguously Danielic roots”. Other concepts, Wenham posits, such as the “mystery that is revealed”, resurrection to judgment and life, etc, may also have a Danielic origin. Wenham concludes that even if the influence of Daniel is not direct but indirect (“from the broader stream of Jewish apocalyptic thinking that derived much of its inspiration from Daniel”), this would not undermine the plausibility of a Danielic

⁹⁴ Dan 7 has frequently been mentioned in relation to the provenance of ‘The Son of Man’ in the Gospels, but seldom have such discussions led to a larger investigation into the contribution of Daniel to the Gospels. For a survey on the Son of Man discussion, see D. R. Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*, see also P. M. Casey, *The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, Library of New Testament Studies (London: T&T Clark, 2007).

⁹⁵ Wenham, “The Kingdom of God and Daniel,” 132.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 133.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

background to the kingdom of God motif.⁹⁸ As a possible implication of his investigation, Wenham suggests that perhaps the Son of Man and kingdom concepts have a “common exegetical root” and should be understood together.⁹⁹ Wenham’s short two-page article makes some attractive, yet sensational claims, the evidence for which is still inconclusive and requires further attention and a more extensive study that involves detailed textual analysis.

More recently, other scholars have begun to recognize the presence and importance of Danielic influence on central ideas within the Gospels. A. Y. Collins, writing in J. J. Collins’ commentary on Daniel for the *Hermeneia* series, devotes an entire chapter to the use of Daniel in the New Testament.¹⁰⁰ A. Y. Collins’ survey begins with a discussion of the “Son of Man” tradition (Dan 7:13), which she identifies as “the most conspicuous and important influence of Daniel on the New Testament.”¹⁰¹ Accordingly, Collins isolates the Son of Man expression from the rest of Daniel for study, and examines the use of the “Son of Man” phrases in the New Testament, including the Gospel of Mark. In Mark, the “Son of Man” sayings are closely related to Jesus’ identity in the Gospel.¹⁰² Collins identifies Mark 8:38 as the first clear allusion to Dan 7:13 and remarks that the traditional classification of Son of Man sayings into three groups is illuminating for Mark.¹⁰³ Following this discussion, Collins surveys the Danielic content in the New Testament apart from the Son of Man tradition. She concludes that Daniel 7 had the greatest influence on the

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Pace P. Vielhauer, “Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu,” in *Aufsätze Zum Neuen Testament* (Munich: Kaiser, 1965), 55-91.

¹⁰⁰ Collins, “The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament.”

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 90.

¹⁰² Ibid., 97.

¹⁰³ The three groups are: 1) sayings dealing with the apocalyptic role of the Son of Man, 2) sayings referring to the suffering, death, and resurrection of the Son of Man, and 3) sayings expressing the authority of the Son of Man in the present. See D. R. A. Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).

New Testament, primarily because of the description of the “one like a son of man.”¹⁰⁴ Also important for the New Testament was the imagery related to the eschatological adversary (i.e., Dan 7, 8 11), the “desolating abomination” of Dan 9:27, and the influence of Daniel 12 on the New Testament idea of resurrection.¹⁰⁵ While Collins does a formidable job of identifying Danielic influences in the New Testament, she does not elaborate on how the various references to Daniel are used in particular New Testament writings, nor does she elucidate whether the various citations and allusions to Daniel function in any collective way in a given New Testament text. Furthermore, it is curious that Collins’ study is so dominated by the Son of Man tradition, when the “one like a son of man” only appears in one verse in the entire book of Daniel, and also belongs to a larger vision with other closely related images and themes. Surely, if the Son of Man is such an important concept for New Testament writers, adequate attention should also be given to the surrounding images and ideas in which it is embedded (i.e., the kingdom motif, etc.).

L. Hartman explores the literary construction and forms of Jewish Apocalyptic texts and the significance of this investigation for various eschatological discourses in the New Testament.¹⁰⁶ In particular, Hartman’s analysis of the eschatological discourse of Mark 13 shows that Mark depended heavily on various chapters of Daniel (Dan 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12) to the extent that he designates Mark 13 a “midrash” on Daniel.¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, Hartman notes that Mark’s combination of paraenetic materials with eschatological material is uncommon in early Jewish

¹⁰⁴ Collins, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," 112.

¹⁰⁵ See also Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*.

¹⁰⁶ L. Hartman, *Prophecy interpreted. The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par.* (ConBNT 1; Lund: Gleerup, 1966).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 174.

apocalyptic texts.¹⁰⁸ Hartman demonstrates that Mark uses Daniel for its eschatological emphases but also exhibits innovative insertions of admonitions within that material.

M. D. Hooker's *Son of Man in Mark* explores the background to the Markan use of the Son of Man in Dan 7, 1 En, and various other texts in the Pseudepigrapha.¹⁰⁹ Hooker suggests that the "one like a son of man" in Daniel was not simply used as "apocalyptic symbolism", but expresses "fundamental truths" about the righteous nucleus of Israel, which include her authority, the necessity for suffering, and the confidence in final vindication.¹¹⁰ Hooker writes that "the Son of man is not simply one who appears at the end of time to act as judge: rather it is because he is Son of man now—i.e. elect, obedient, faithful, and therefore suffering—that he will be vindicated as Son of man in the future: the eschatological role of the Son of man is based upon his obedient response to God now."¹¹¹ Hooker asserts that even within Dan 7, the referent of the "one like a son of man" oscillates between corporate and individual,¹¹² and that Mark (and possibly Jesus himself) understood the Danielic "one like a son of man" in this way.

However, M. Casey, in his monumental monograph *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* has argued in the opposite direction.¹¹³ Casey maintains that Dan 7 contains no "Son of man concept", and that the figure in the vision of Dan 7 does not suffer.¹¹⁴ Casey evaluates seven suggested Danielic references in Mark (Mark 1:15; 2:10; 8:38; 9:12; 10:45; 13:26; and 14:62) and

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 175.

¹⁰⁹ M. D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*.

¹¹⁰ Ibid. 189, 192.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 190.

¹¹² Ibid., 192-3.

¹¹³ M. Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 26, 48.

concludes that apart from Mark 13:26 and 14:62, none of them are valid Danielic references. However, he considers the allusion to Dan 7 to be a literal, rather than figurative description of Jesus' parousia. Casey concludes that since Jesus preached about the kingdom of God and not his own parousia, these sayings are the product of the work of early Christian exegetes "some time after the death and Resurrection of Jesus".¹¹⁵

N. T. Wright, in his chapter on eschatology ("The Hope of Israel") in *The New Testament and the People of God* suggests that first century readers of Dan 7 would have understood the vision "in terms of the vindication of Israel after her suffering at the hands of the pagans", and that the "one like a son of man" functions as a symbol for Israel.¹¹⁶ Wright's conclusion is based on his differentiation between a literary and a metaphysical representation of the "one like a son of man".¹¹⁷ Wright also insists that Dan 7 should be understood in the context of Dan 1-6, especially the stories of the vindication of Daniel and his companions.¹¹⁸ For this reason, the theme in both sections of Daniel is the vindication of those who hold firm to God "when the kingdoms of the world will finally give way to the everlasting kingdom of the one true god".¹¹⁹ Finally, Wright also observes that Dan 7 was the inspiration for various first-century messianic speculations.¹²⁰

C. Evans, writing in an edited two-volume work by J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint, *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception* (2002), explores the topic of

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 218.

¹¹⁶ N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 292.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 293-4.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 294.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 314.

the Danielic kingdom theme in the New Testament, especially in the Gospels.¹²¹ He argues against B. Mack's contention that the Kingdom of God is better understood in the light of Hellenistic wisdom traditions "without any allusion to Jewish ideology at all".¹²² Evans supplies an impressive set of textual data from the Hebrew Bible, as well as various early Jewish sources, to critique Mack's unfounded conclusion.¹²³ In particular, Evans suggests that there is evidence that Daniel's vision of the kingdom was a significant contribution to the New Testament writers' understanding of the kingdom of God. Evans begins by tracing the development of the kingdom motif within the book of Daniel itself, as well as the reception of this tradition in later interpretation in second-temple Jewish sources. He then discusses elements from Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God in the Gospels against this background. Evans identifies at least seven elements that he sees as indicators of Daniel's influence in Jesus' understanding of the kingdom of God: 1) the emphatic qualification that the awaited kingdom is God's kingdom, 2) the language of imminence, 3) the kingdom as "mystery", 4) the stone that crushes, (5) the saying about what is "not made with hands", 6) promises to the disciples, and (7) the "abomination of desolation."¹²⁴ Evans explores these elements and their relation to Daniel at length, and attempts to demonstrate that the proclamation of the Kingdom in the Gospels was "significantly informed by the eschatological hope of the book of Daniel".¹²⁵ Evans' work is informative, and his argument for a Jewish origin for the New Testament phrase and the concept of the Kingdom of God is convincing; however, it is unclear why he chooses to conflate the four Gospels' portrayal of the

¹²¹ Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God Kingdom," 490-527.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 491.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 498.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 510-23.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

Kingdom of God into one, implying that the four evangelists shared an identical vision of the kingdom of God. Evans' study is useful as a topical study into the kingdom of God from a New Testament theology perspective, and indeed the research on the Jewish background of the theme is invaluable, but the application of his findings to the question of the function of Danielic content in Mark will require a more detailed study of Daniel in Mark specifically. Be that as it may, Evans' study reflects a current scholarly trend that is paying increasing attention to the contribution of Danielic thought and content to the New Testament.

In several recently published works, J. D. G. Dunn (2001), M. B. Shepherd (2006), and G. W. E. Nickelsburg (2007) have independently affirmed the influence of Dan 7 on the New Testament Son of Man tradition. Dunn's essay, entitled "The Danielic Son of Man in the New Testament", explores the evidence of influence from the vision(s) of Dan 7 on various New Testament texts and concludes that the visions of Dan 7 were influential in the formation of New Testament writings, especially in shaping elements within the Gospel tradition and in even more so in shaping the visions of Revelation.¹²⁶ According to Dunn, the influence of Dan 7:13-14 is deeply rooted in the Synoptic tradition and is independent of the developed Danielic version of the Similitudes.¹²⁷ He also grants that Mark 1:15 may provide an indication of a kingdom motif in the Synoptic tradition (with Evans) that is partly dependent on the Danielic vision in Dan 7:22. Despite the influence of Dan 7 on the Gospels, Dunn draws attention to the fact that outside of the Gospels and Revelation, there are no clear allusions to Dan 7 in the rest of the New Testament. From this Dunn concludes that a Danielic Son of Man Christology was not important within

¹²⁶ Dunn, "The Danielic Son of Man in the New Testament," 537.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 540. M. Müller also maintains that the Son of Man expression cannot be traced back before its emergence in Mark. See M. Müller, *Son of Man*, 419.

the rest of Christianity as represented in the New Testament. Whether or not one agrees with Dunn's conclusions, his observations and insights on the Danielic passages and the New Testament texts that rely on them are a welcome contribution to the study of Daniel in Mark.

The subject of M. Shepherd's article in the *Westminster Theological Journal* is also the New Testament Son of Man in light of Dan 7:13. Contrary to many critical scholars, Shepherd remains convinced that both Jesus and the New Testament writers understand the Danielic "one like a son of man" as an individual and messianic figure. Shepherd writes, "The linguistic and exegetical tools of modern scholarship have been wielded for every conceivable interpretation of Dan 7:13 with the exception of what has been called by James Montgomery¹²⁸ the earliest and past prevailing interpretation among Jews and Christians—the messianic interpretation."¹²⁹ However, it is not clear how the evidence points towards a 'messianic interpretation', which Shepherd does not define. For example, Shepherd maintains that the phrase "at the end of the days" באחרית הימים/באחרית ימיאע in Dan 2:28/10:14 links the eschatology of Daniel to that of the rest of the canon where the phrase is also found.¹³⁰ Shepherd claims that "therefore, the coming king from Judah is the most likely candidate for the head of the everlasting kingdom in Daniel...God is the ruler of the kingdom, and he gives it to whomever he pleases. His choice is the coming king from Judah—the one 'like a son of man' in Dan

¹²⁸ J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927), 317-20.

¹²⁹ M. B. Shepherd, "Daniel 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man," *Westminster Theological Journal* 68, no. 1 (2006): 99.

¹³⁰ I.e. Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; 8:18; Josh 23:21; Neh 8:18; Hos 3:5; Mic 4:1; Isa 2:2; Jer 25:19; 37:24; Ezek 38:10.

7:13.”¹³¹ Shepherd also surveys and comments on some of the recent discussions regarding the Son of Man debate, but offers little in the way of new insights. While Shepherd’s proposal is promising, it ultimately fails to convince due to the fact that his argument is neither sufficiently coherent nor critical, and he fails to address some of the leading voices in the Son of Man debate (i.e. J. J. Collins, M. Casey, N. Perrin, P. Vielhauer, M. Hooker, etc).

G. W. E. Nickelsburg, in a recently published, expanded version, of his seminal *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, also includes a chapter on the state of affairs in the Son of Man debate.¹³² Unlike Shepherd’s survey, Nickelsburg’s attempt is thorough and meticulous. After tracing the relationship of Dan 7 with 1 Enoch, Wisdom, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch, Nickelsburg concludes that these texts attest a common model of an eschatological, transcendent judge and deliverer “that was composed of elements from Israelite traditions about the Davidic king, the Deutero-Isaianic servant/chosen one, and the Danielic ‘one like a son of man.’”¹³³ Nickelsburg reserves a section to discuss the Son of Man in Mark’s Gospel, in which he finds that Mark’s use of Son of Man has a dual role of a designation for the human Jesus as well as pointing to his future status as the exalted messianic judge.¹³⁴ The ambiguous phrase is used by Mark as a plot device “to perpetuate the mystery of Jesus’ identity among the human characters in the story”.¹³⁵ Nickelsburg’s treatment of Danielic content in Mark is brief, but his attempt to examine the literary function of “Son of Man” within Mark’s Gospel is to

¹³¹ Ibid., 104.

¹³² G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Son of Man in Judaism and Early Christianity,” in *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism. Expanded Edition* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2007), 281-314.

¹³³ Ibid., 292.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 299.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

be commended and is of particular interest to this present study. Nickelsburg also asserts more broadly that the key feature in the New Testament Son of Man traditions is the emphasis of ascribing judicial functions to the exalted Jesus to the neglect of the Danielic motif of kingship.¹³⁶ To the contrary, the present study will endeavour to show that the concept of kingship is dominant in Mark's use of Daniel.

Finally, it is necessary to look at the work of Merling Alomía, whose publication in *Theologika*, entitled "Cómo es usado Daniel en Marcos", proposes to cover the same ground as the present project.¹³⁷ Alomía agrees with both Wenham and Evans that the kingdom of God motif in Mark derives from Daniel, and that Mark uses Danielic language as "prophetic support" for his claims about Jesus.¹³⁸ In addition to the kingdom of God theme, Alomía also points to the Danielic elements of the "abomination of desolation", judgment, and the "Son of Man", and concludes that for Mark, Daniel is "el libro más importante".¹³⁹ Alomía suggests that Mark employs Daniel in order to give the eschatological teaching of Jesus prophetic grounding ("como el ancla profética segura").¹⁴⁰ In other words, Mark endorses and validates his claims about Jesus and his teachings through the use of the prophetic authority of Daniel. However, Alomía's analysis is not sufficiently informed by the use of Daniel by early Jewish writers, which often involved complex re-interpretations of Daniel, suggesting that the notion Mark uses Daniel merely for "prophetic support" may be too simplistic a solution.

In addition, although Alomía is successful in tracing the contours of the Markan usage of Daniel, he says little about the function of the Danielic references in Mark's

¹³⁶ Ibid., 312.

¹³⁷ M. Alomía, "Cómo Es Usado Daniel En Marcos" in *Theologika* 16 no. 1 (2001): 2-30.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 10.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 12.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 28.

narrative or theology, other than to show that Jesus' teachings and identity is in accordance with the Scriptures.

1.3.3. Summary

In this review of the secondary literature it can be seen that although many have written about the Old Testament in Mark, and even Daniel or Danielic elements in Mark, the systematic analysis of the overall contribution of Danielic content to Mark's narrative and theology has yet to be conducted. Although Daniel's influence on Mark has been recognized by numerous scholars (Sundberg, Schultz, Suhl, Kee, Wenham, Smith, Anderson, Collins, Alomía), to a large extent, the study of Daniel in Mark has been dominated, even stalled, by debates concerning the Son of Man enigma. The method in these studies often involves taking the phrase "Son of Man" in isolation from the larger narrative and comparing it with Son of Man sayings either in the rest of the Gospel or the other Gospels. Such a narrow approach has little regard for the function of the phrase in the larger context or the relationship of the phrase to other Danielic concepts that may be present. However, recently, the study of the contribution of Daniel to Mark has gained popularity with new questions asked of Daniel's kingdom motif (Shepherd, Evans, Alomía), as well as a renewed interest in the possible influence of Dan 7 on the New Testament Son of Man (Dunn, Shepherd, Nickelsburg). Alomía, who is presently the only one to look specifically at the use of Daniel in Mark, traces the contours of Markan use of Daniel, and concludes that above all, the function of these references is as a prophetic validation of Mark's presentation of Jesus. However, Alomía's discussion is not concerned with the contribution and function of Daniel to Mark's narrative, theology, or his

presentation of who Jesus was—all of which are at the centre of the present investigation.

1.4. RESEARCH METHOD

The research method of the present study of Mark's use of Daniel will be guided by three questions, each yielding a further set of enquiries:

1) First, what pattern of usage of Daniel can be observed in early Jewish literature? Was Daniel widely read and used by early Jewish writers? What attitudes did early Jewish writers have toward the book of Daniel? How did they employ Danielic material in their own writings? The answers to these questions will provide a necessary literary and historical background from which to observe Mark's use of Daniel. Chapter 2 of the dissertation surveys the use of Daniel in various works of early Jewish literature to demonstrate two important points: firstly, this study demonstrates that Daniel was available to Mark and the audience of Mark could reasonably be expected to be familiar with the material, and secondly, that there are both precedent and antecedent examples of allusions to Daniel in the early Jewish literature outside of Mark. Against this literary backdrop, Mark's use of Danielic allusions can then be contextualized and charted alongside his contemporaries' use of Danielic allusions for comparison.

2) What does Mark's use of Daniel actually look like and how did he use Daniel? Which parts and what versions of Daniel's text are being referenced? Where in Mark are these references deployed? What is the basis for inferring an intertextual relationship in the first place? What is the strength of the relationship? What is the function of the Danielic reference? In the narrative of Mark, what is to be gained by including such a reference to Daniel? To answer these questions, chapter 3 of the

present study proceeds with the exegesis of each of the Markan texts identified by the NA27 and UBS4 editors to contain references to Daniel. Additionally, there are two other passages where allusions to Daniel may be present but are not as yet recognized by the NA27 and UBS4 editors. The present study's exegetical approach will consist of three sections: 1) a discussion of the Markan context of the Danielic reference, 2) a close examination of the suggested Danielic reference, and 3) an analysis of the literary function of the Danielic reference. The validity of the Danielic reference will also be evaluated with the following considerations: 1) the Danielic reference must be shown to contain (at least two) lexical, grammatical, or conceptual parallels with Mark, 2) it must be demonstrated that the Danielic reference must come from Daniel and not another Jewish text, 3) a Danielic reference is more likely if the Markan text exhibits knowledge of the larger context of the reference, and 4) it must be shown when possible what version of Daniel (MT, LXX, Θ) Mark is using. The function of each Danielic reference will also be discussed. How does alluding to Daniel, in particular, enhance or complement what Mark is trying to communicate about Jesus? Discussions about the use of Daniel in Mark's Gospel thus far have been dominated by questions about Mark's ideology rather than how Daniel is actually used in his narrative.¹⁴¹ This chapter will attempt to sketch out the contours and functions of individual references to Daniel.

3) What patterns emerge out of examining all of Mark's references to Daniel at once? What is the cumulative force of the Danielic references, and how does this affect the narrative and message of Mark? What is Mark's *modus operandi* for employing references to Daniel? Chapter 4 synthesizes the data gathered in chapter 2

¹⁴¹ Stanley, "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method," p. 45.

(how early Jewish writers use Daniel) and chapter 3 (how Mark uses Daniel) to comment on the overall shape and function of Mark's use of Daniel against the background of the use of Daniel in early Jewish literature. The chapter concludes with the contention that Mark primarily uses Daniel to express the Markan theme of the kingdom of God.

1.5. Research Data

In order to minimize subjectivity and maximize the relevance of this dissertation, the only texts selected for examination are those that have already been recognized by the majority of scholars for their potential allusions to Daniel, with the exception of two texts that I make a case for inclusion within the list of Danielic allusions. In both the NA27 and UBS4 Greek texts of the New Testament, the editors responsible for the editions provide cross-references in the margins or at the bottom of the page. In the introduction to the UBS4, the following categories are given for the cross-references provided: 1) quotations from biblical and non-biblical books, 2) definite allusions, where it is assumed that the writer had in mind a specific passage of Scripture, and 3) literary and other parallels.¹⁴² As a result, the texts that are referenced are flagged as having some relation to the Markan verse in question, however, there is no further differentiation as to which category the literary relationship should be identified within. For example, in the cross-reference entry for Mark 13:26¹⁴³ “τὸν υἱὸν ... δόξης Dn 7.13-14; Mk 8:38; Rev 1.7” is listed without any clues as to whether the editors are suggesting that the Danielic reference is a quotation (category 1), a definite allusion (category 2), or a literary parallel (category

¹⁴² Barbara Aland and United Bible Societies., *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1993), 46*.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 175.

3). In the NA27 text, the editors indicate that direct quotations are represented by italics, whereas allusions are in normal type. However, as with the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, there is also no explanation for, or evaluation of, the rationale behind selecting the texts that have been cross-referenced. The following table shows where in Mark the editors of the critical Greek texts perceived some relation to Daniel:

Figure 1: Danielic References Identified by the NA27 and UBS4 Editors.

NA27 Text	UBS4 Text
Mark 1:15/ Dan 7:22	
Mark 4:11/ Dan 2:27s.47	
Mark 4:32/ Dan 4:9,18	Mark 4:32 / Dan 4:12,21 (NRSV)
Mark 9:3 / Dan 7:9	
Mark 13:7/ Dan 2:28s, 45	
Mark 13:13 / Dan 12:12	
Mark 13:14/ <i>Dan 12:11; 11:31; 9:27</i>	Mark 13:14/ Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11
Mark 13:19/ Dan 12:1	Mark 13:19/ Dan 12:1
Mark 13:26/ <i>Dan 7:13s</i>	Mark 13:26/ Dan 7:13-14
Mark 14:62/ <i>Dan 7:13</i>	Mark 14:62 / Dan 7:13

The NA27 text identifies three 'direct quotations' (Mark 13:14; 13:26; 14:62), and seven other *loci* where a Danielic allusion is observed.¹⁴⁴ The UBS4 text, which makes no distinctions between direct quotations and allusions, identifies five Danielic references. The five references selected in the UBS4 text are also among those references selected in the NA27 text. For the purpose of this study, since none of the direct quotations noted by the NA27 contain citation formulas, they are simply referred to as references. The research data will be composed of the cross-references

¹⁴⁴ E. Nestle, K. Aland, et al, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th ed., (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblestiftung, 1993).

to Daniel in the Gospel of Mark from both the NA27 and UBS4, plus two potential allusions not presently recognized by the editors of these Greek New Testaments.¹⁴⁵

According to the editors of the NA27 and UBS4 texts, there are ten verses containing a reference to Daniel, appearing in five out of sixteen chapters of Mark. It will be helpful to observe the pattern of the distribution of these references across the Gospel of Mark as is evidenced by the figure below.

Figure 2: The Frequency and Distribution of Danielic References in Mark.

Chapter in Mark	# of Danielic References	Potential Danielic References
1	1 (Mark 1:15)	Dan 7:22
2	---	
3	---	
4	2 (Mark 4:11; Mark 4:32)	Dan 2:27-28, 47; 4:9,12,18, 21
5	---	
6	---	
7	---	
8	---	
9	1 (Mark 9:3)	Dan 7:9
10	---	
11	---	
12	---	
13	5 (Mark 13:7; 13:13; 13:14; 13:19; 13:26)	Dan 2:28-29, 45; 12:12; 12:11; 11:31; 9:27; 12:1; 7:13 s
14	1 (Mark 14:62)	Dan 7:13
15	---	

The majority of the occurrences appear only once per chapter—except in chapter 4 where they appear twice. Chapter 13 contains the highest concentration of Danielic references with five occurrences. It can be seen from this distribution that references to Daniel can be found in multiple pericopes and across different settings in Mark’s narrative, as shown in the figure below:

¹⁴⁵ Mark 8:38; 14:58.

Figure 3: Markan Narrative Settings of Danielic References.

	Markan Narrative Settings of Danielic References
Mark 1	In the proclamation of Jesus at the beginning of his public ministry.
Mark 4	In Jesus' remarks about the mystery of the kingdom, and in the parable of the mustard seed and the kingdom of God.
Mark 9	A description of Jesus at the transfiguration.
Mark 13	Throughout Jesus' apocalyptic Olivet discourse.
Mark 14	In response to the High Priest at the trial of Jesus.

There are references to Daniel at the beginning, middle, and end of Mark's narrative, and they all seem to occur at significant points of Jesus' life (e.g., opening proclamation, transfiguration, eschatological pronouncement, climatic response in trial scene, etc.). This resonates with Kee's observation that Old Testament citations (quotations and allusions) appear at crucial points in the development of Mark's narrative.¹⁴⁶ Danielic allusions also occur in the teaching of Jesus¹⁴⁷, and remarkably, apart from the allusion in Mark 9 which is a description of the transfigured Jesus, are only found in the direct speeches of Jesus.

The Danielic material alluded to comes from Daniel 2, 4, 7, and 12. This is significant in that the material alluded to spans both the Danielic court narratives of chapters 1 through 6 and the Danielic revelations from 7 through 12, and come from both Aramaic and Hebrew sections of the book. The fact that the alluded material comes from different parts of Daniel is encouraging because it attests to the compositional unity of Daniel early in the 1st century, and so it increases the

¹⁴⁶ Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," 175-6. See also Evans, "The Beginning of the Good News and the Fulfillment of Scripture in the Gospel of Mark," 85.

¹⁴⁷ Mark 1, 4; 13.

likelihood that Mark is dependent on a written tradition of Daniel rather than independently circulated oral traditions. Taking the resonance between Jesus who is delivered by God and Daniel who is delivered from the lion's den as evidence, Kee contends that not only is Mark's portrayal influenced by the Danielic Son of Man, but "by the figure Daniel himself".¹⁴⁸ Although Kee is possibly overstating his case in this instance, he is correct in his estimation of the importance of the book of Daniel to the composition of Mark's Gospel.

1.6. Research Assumptions & Definitions

Every dissertation has to operate on certain assumptions based on the goals and limitations of that dissertation. For the present study there are some assumptions and definitions that need to be clearly stated.

- 1) The term "Mark" is used to refer to the author of the eponymous Gospel, but actually yields very little information as to this author's identity. No arguments will be made based on the identity of the author because the author's identity is not of any particular import for this study and could comprise an entire dissertation in itself. In the same way, "Daniel" will be used to refer to the author of the book of Daniel 1-12 without making any assumptions about the historical authors of the book of Daniel.
- 2) The present study assumes a Maccabean date (167-164 B.C.E.) for the final form of the Hebrew/Aramaic book of Daniel, following the suggestion of J. J. Collins, with the Greek versions developing after that date.¹⁴⁹ The present study will also assume Markan priority among the Synoptic Gospels, and take the traditional date of 65-70

¹⁴⁸ Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," 187-8.

¹⁴⁹ J. J. Collins, *Daniel*. Hermeneia. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1993), 38.

C.E. for the final form of Mark,¹⁵⁰ taking the calamity mentioned in Mark 13 to refer to the Jewish War of 66-70 C.E. rather than the persecution of Caligula circa 40 C.E.¹⁵¹

3) The writer of this dissertation acknowledges that it is likely Mark made use of sources to compose his gospel, and for the sake of the present argument it will be assumed that Mark agreed with the sources he used. Consequently, regardless of the original provenance of the material, content in Mark will be assumed to be authored by Mark for the sake of simplicity.¹⁵²

4) The present study is a literary study of Mark's use of Daniel and will not endeavour to discuss historical issues related to certain phrases and expressions. For example, the Son of Man will be discussed in length with regard to its provenance and literary function in Mark, but the present study will refrain from engaging in debate about whether the term was employed by the historical Jesus. All discussions of the life, message, and intention of Jesus in the dissertation refer to the Markan portrayal of Jesus.

5) In order to design a project that will fit into the limits of the current dissertation and to avoid debates about what constitutes a genuine reference to Daniel, the Danielic references from the NA27 and UBS4 have been taken as a somewhat neutral starting point into the investigation of Mark's use of Daniel. Expressions such as "every Danielic reference in Mark" refer to references in the data set of the

¹⁵⁰ See M. E. Boring, *Mark: A Commentary*, 14-5.

¹⁵¹ An earlier date of Mark, based on Jesus' view of the Jewish Law, and the argument that Mark 13 could also refer to the persecution under Caligula, is proposed by J. G. Crossley, see James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel: Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 206-209.

¹⁵² This study will follow Boring's suggestion that Mark was probably aware of the existence of Q but did not make use of it in his composition. Boring, *Mark*, 14.

current study (i.e. those noted by the NA27 text). It is acknowledged that other references to Daniel exist and the hope of this writer is that the results of the current study will lead to a fuller understanding of other potential references to Daniel.

6) The term “reference” will be used to describe Mark’s intertextual usage of Daniel that includes quotations, allusions, as well as echoes. For this reason, the terms “reference” and “allusion” are sometimes used interchangeably. Since none of Mark’s intertextual usage of Daniel includes introductory citation formulas, under the criteria of C. Stanley,¹⁵³ they should all be considered “allusions” or “echoes”. However, the NA27 text indicates by way of italics that three of the Markan texts contain “direct quotations” to Daniel, clearly adopting a different criteria from that of Stanley’s. To avoid confusion, the term reference will be used generally to refer to any instance of Mark’s intertextual use of Daniel.

7) In regard to the more oblique Danielic references, it is difficult to determine precisely which version of the Old Testament Mark uses (MT, LXX, Θ, Mark’s own translation, oral tradition, or some other unknown source). However, in cases where there are sufficient linguistic similarities between the Markan text and a particular version of Daniel, attempts have been made to identify the source of Mark’s reference.

8) It is acknowledged that it is possible that Danielic allusions were not taken from the text of Daniel directly, but were drawn instead from a larger Danielic tradition that was common knowledge in early Judaism. However, given Mark’s propensity to use materials that contain quotations and extended allusions to other Old Testament

¹⁵³ See discussion of Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," 92.

works throughout his narrative, it makes the most sense to assume that he was also familiar with the text of Daniel.

9) Rahlfs' *Septuaginta* will be used as the primary Greek Old Testament text in this dissertation. However, for the book of Daniel, Ziegler's critical edition of Daniel will also often be consulted and discussed, especially where there are noteworthy textual variants, and where Ziegler's text deviates significantly from Rahlfs'.

10) Unless otherwise noted, English translations of the Biblical and Old Testament Apocrypha texts are excerpted from the New Revised Standard Version.

CHAPTER 2—THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN EARLY JEWISH LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a survey of the references to the Book of Daniel in Jewish literature in the time period both contemporaneous to and immediately prior to the writing of the Gospel of Mark.¹ While there have been several studies regarding the history of interpretation of early Jewish literature, they primarily provide summaries and do not discuss the relevant texts in detail.² The following analysis will examine the textual evidence of alleged references to Daniel by focusing on how Daniel is implicitly and explicitly used in each of these texts.³ Although Daniel is explicitly alluded to in both 1 Macc 2:59-60 and 3 Macc 6:6-7 which were composed before the end of the first century B.C.E, J. J. Collins

¹ The present study will assume a Markan priority, placing the date of composition of around 70 C.E, during the Jewish War of 66-70 C.E. The internal evidence for such a time frame is found in Mark 13 with its mention of the “desolating sacrilege”, intense persecution, messianic pretenders, and the fact that the events of Mark 13:24-27 had not yet taken place. J. G. Crossley argues that the persecution in Mark 13 could also refer to the Caligula crisis of 40 C.E., and thus posits a much earlier date for Mark, circa 35-45 C.E. See the fuller discussion in James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark’s Gospel: Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 40-41, 208.

² Notable surveys regarding the history of interpretation of Daniel include J. J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), and the essay of A. Y. Collins, “The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament”, 72-123; C. A. Evans and S. Talmon (eds.), *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Honor of James A. Sanders* (BIS 28; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 595-611, and L. L. Grabbe, “A Dan(iel) For All Seasons” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 2, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 236-244.

³ Texts in Greek and Hebrew will be analysed in their original languages, but texts in Ethiopic (1 Enoch) and Syriac (4 Ezra) will be discussed using English translations with assistance from secondary sources.

contends that the earliest known reference to Daniel is in *Sibylline Oracle 3*. He suggests that although the dating of some sections of *Sibylline Oracle 3* is contested, the “original nucleus” of the work dates back to the mid-second century B.C.E.¹ Following Collins’ suggestion, this literary survey of Early Jewish writing will begin with *Sibylline Oracle 3*, (circa 150 B.C.E.), which leads to the Qumran manuscripts (circa 50 B.C.E. to 70 C.E.), Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* (circa 80 C.E.), and 2 Baruch (circa 100 C.E.). The time period under consideration spans 250 years: ranging from 150 B.C.E. to 100 C.E. The extra-biblical writings examined below include: *Sibylline Oracle 3*, 1 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, and from the Qumran texts: the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, 4QpsDan, 4Q 246 (The so-called ‘Son of God text’), 4Q 174 (Florilegium), 4Q243-245 (pseudo-Daniel), and 4Q552-553 (The Talking Trees Vision)—as well as the *Similitudes of Enoch*, 4 Ezra (2 Esdras), 2 *Apocalypse of Baruch*, and Josephus (*Jewish Antiquities* and the *Jewish War*).

Close textual examination of these texts reveals that the use of Daniel was not confined to a small subset of Judaism; in fact, a broad spectrum of diverse Early Jewish writers made use of Daniel. Such widespread use of Daniel in early Jewish literature strengthens the argument that the writer of Mark may have drawn upon the inspiration of Daniel’s text. Furthermore, an investigation into which parts of Daniel early Jewish writers drew upon, as well as an exploration of the manner in which they used this material will be illuminating for the present study of the distribution and function of Daniel in the gospel of Mark. The present chapter provides the historical context out of which the use of Daniel in Mark arises.

¹ Collins, *Daniel*, 72.

2.2. Survey of the Use of Daniel in Early Jewish Literature

The survey of the use of Daniel in Early Jewish literature is arranged according to literary type: Jewish-Influenced Greek Oracles (*Sibylline Oracle 3*), Revolutionary theological/historical narratives (1, 3, 4 Maccabees), Documents collected by Sectarians (The Qumran writings), Apocalypses and Visionary Traditions (4 Ezra, *Similitudes of Enoch*, 2 Baruch), and Historiography (Josephus). In the investigation of the use of Daniel in these documents, the following questions will be raised: What kind of document is it? What are its contents? When was this document written? What kind of background does the author (or authors) originate from? What is the reference to the Book of Daniel and how does the reference function in the document? Through the exploration of these questions, a distinct pattern of the usage of Daniel in Early Jewish Literature begins to emerge.

2.2.1. *Sibylline Oracle 3*

2.2.1.1 *Contents*

The *Sibylline Oracles* are a collection of prophetic utterances attributed to the Sibyl, a female prophetess who foretold divine revelations. In their present form, the *Sibylline Oracles* consist of fourteen books written by authors of varied origins (Jewish & Christian) that spans the 2nd century B.C.E. and the 7th century C.E. The genre of the *Sibylline Oracles* originates from Roman culture. The oracles are divine revelations ascribed to prophetesses that were written down in the form of Greek hexameter. The *Sibylline Oracles* are the result of Jewish and Christian writers utilizing this Roman literary tradition. While some of the books of the *Sibylline Oracles* are Jewish in origin, others are Christian, and still others are Christian adaptations of oracles originally composed by Jews. According to J. J. Collins, the

majority of *Sibylline Oracle 3* was written by Jews in Alexandria at the time of Philometor, and accordingly, they can be dated to the 2nd century B.C.E.² The other sections of *Sibylline Oracle 3* are comprised of oracles taken from different time periods, including the pagan Erythrean sibyl (401-88), the campaign of Cleopatra from the 1st century B.C.E. (350-380), and even as late the time of the Emperor Nero (63-74).³ Eschatological hope in the restoration of a Jewish kingdom and the Jewish temple is a recurring theme among the earliest Jewish oracles. Collins notes that the emphasis on the traditional Jewish hope of the restoration of the nation around the Jewish Temple sets the oracles apart from the other apocalypses which are inclined to be more fantastical and include supernatural elements, such as angels and bodily resurrection.⁴

2.2.1.2. Functions

The most recognized potential allusion to Daniel is found in *Sib. Or.* 3:397, “ἐκ δέκα δὲ κέρατων, παρὰ δὲ φυτὸν ἄλλο φυτεύσει”. The purple clad villain of *Sib. Or.* 3:388-400 shall “put forth a side-shoot of ten horns” a detail reminiscent of the ten-horned fourth beast of Dan 7:7: “εἶχε δὲ κέρατα δέκα”.⁵ However, the allusion is marginal as there are few other similarities between the two accounts aside from the symbol of the ten horns and the dominance of the tyrant.

In *Sib. Or.* 3:156-161, there is a description of the succession of kingdoms that at first glance, seems to recall the kingdoms mentioned in Dan 10-11: “And all the families of the Titans and of Cronos died. Then in the circling course of time the Egyptian empire arose, then that of the Persians, of the Medes and Ethiopians and of

² The Jewish elements of *Sibylline Oracle 3* include: *Sib. Or.* 3:97–161; 162–95; 196–294; 545–656; 657–808.

³ J. J. Collins, “*Sibylline Oracles*” in *ABD 6* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 3-5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁵ The same description is given in Dan 7:20, 24.

Assyrian Babylon, then that of the Macedonians, again that of Egypt and then of Rome.” These kingdoms will be followed by “the nation of the Mighty God”, who “shall be again powerful, that nation which shall be to all mortals the guide of life.”⁶ However, even though the general schema of worldly kingdoms being superseded by God’s kingdom fits in with the picture of Daniel, this list of powers does not correspond neatly with the four kingdom motif used in Daniel. The vision of the ram and the goat in Dan 8 correspond to Media, Persia, and Greece, however, there is no mention of the other nations. Daniel 11 does narrate the struggle between Egypt and Greece, as well as the arrival of the Romans (i.e., the ships of the Kittim in Dan 11:30). The writer of *Sibylline Oracle 3* does not appear to be drawing on any specific text, but seems to share the same ideas about the succession of kingdoms that was prevalent at that time. In light of the divergent details, even if *Sibylline Oracle 3* did make use of Dan 10-11, it was not a primary influence and therefore further consideration of this text falls outside of the scope of this dissertation.

In *Sib. Or.* 3:47-48, the writer explains that when the time comes and Rome finally rules over Egypt “the mightiest kingdom of the immortal king over men will appear (βασιλεία μεγίστη ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώποισι), and a holy prince will come and rule over the whole Earth forever.” Even mighty Rome will not stand, because there will be an “inexorable wrath on Latin men.” However, as with the previous examples, apart from a tenuous connection to the motif of God’s kingdom rising up against other kingdoms, there is neither a specific lexical link nor any definite allusion to Daniel. On the contrary, the existence of various elements foreign to Daniel (i.e. the Children of Cronos, Titan, Gaia and Ouranos, etc),

⁶ *Sib. Or.* 3:194.

suggests that the writer of *Sibylline Oracle 3* is a syncretistic author who draws inspiration from a variety of traditions and composes a unique narrative. The fact that *Sibylline Oracle 3* was written in the Greek hexameter further suggests that the writer was not simply a Jewish author in the traditional sense and that the writer may have been open to the influence of Greco-Roman culture and philosophy.

2.2.2. 1 Maccabees

2.2.2.1. Contents

1 Maccabees is a biblical-historical account of the Jewish struggle and revolt that occurred between 166-135 B.C.E. against Seleucid rule over Judea, led by Mattathias and his five sons. Scholars generally agree that 1 Maccabees was written as early as the late 2nd century B.C.E. and definitely no later than the early 1st century B.C.E. The writer of 1 Maccabees has a favourable disposition towards Romans and writes with a Sadducean-Hasmonean disposition, as is evidenced by the text's legitimization of the Hasmonean rule and the text's opposition to the Pharisees and other apocalyptic sects. It is also noteworthy that eschatology and apocalypticism do not figure prominently in the ideology of 1 Maccabees.⁷ The writer begins by introducing Alexander the Great and the *Diodochoi*, and then proceeds to chronicle events that occurred under Seleucid rule, including the desecration of the Temple in 167 B.C.E.,⁸ the persecution of the Jews and their religious customs, and the response of Mattathias and his sons.

2.2.2.2. Functions

2.2.2.2.1 1 Macc 1:54

⁷ T. Fischer, "Books of Maccabees" in *ABD 4* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 441.

⁸ 1 Macc 1:11-64.

“καὶ τῇ πεντεκαιδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ Χασελευ τῷ πέμπτῳ καὶ τεσσαρακοστῷ καὶ ἑκατοστῷ ἔτει ὠκοδόμησεν βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.”

The first chapter of 1 Maccabees introduces the rise of Antiochus Epiphanes and his conquest over Egypt and Israel. In an effort to unify his kingdom, he commanded that all people under his rule shall forsake their particular customs and adopt the religious practices of the king.⁹ This greatly affected the Jewish people, as they were ordered under pain of death,

to follow customs strange to the land, to forbid burnt offerings and sacrifices and drink offerings in the sanctuary, to profane sabbaths and festivals, to defile the sanctuary and the priests, to build altars and sacred precincts and shrines for idols, to sacrifice swine and other unclean animals, and to leave their sons uncircumcised. They were to make themselves abominable by everything unclean and profane, so that they would forget the law and change all the ordinances (1 Macc 1:44-49).

It was a tremendous time of persecution for the Jews who held steadfast to their customs. 1 Macc 1:54 recounts that on “the fifteenth day of Chislev”, in “the hundred forty-fifth year”, the king’s appointed inspectors erected a “βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως” on top of the sacred altar of burnt offerings at the Jerusalem temple. βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως may refer to a pagan altar which according to Josephus was built atop the existing altar, as pagan sacrifices were then made on this altar in the narrative that follows in 1 Macc 1:59.¹⁰ However, the term βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως itself is probably derived from Dan 11, where an angelic being relates to Daniel what will happen with regard to forthcoming kings and kingdoms. Daniel 11:31 tells of a king whose actions bear a striking resemblance to those of Antiochus Epiphanes in 1 Maccabees: “καὶ βραχίονες παρ’ αὐτοῦ στήσονται καὶ μισήσουσι τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ

⁹ 1 Macc 1: 41-42. While there is much scholarly debate about what Antiochus IV actually did, the current discussion simply relates the events as they are reported in the episode in 1 Macc.

¹⁰ Josephus also attests to this in *Ant* 12:248–64.

φόβου καὶ ἀποστήσουσι τὴν θυσίαν καὶ δώσουσι βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως.” The forces sent by this king will profane the temple, remove the sacrifice and will give (Grk: δίδωμι) a desolating sacrilege in its stead. The term βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως also appears in Dan 9:27 (βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων) and 12:11 (βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως); however, ἐρήμωσις is in the plural in 9:27, and a definite article accompanies ἐρήμωσις in both instances. The chronology of events narrated in the first chapter of 1 Maccabees also mirrors the sequence of events given in Daniel’s prophecy as seen the figure below.

Figure 4: The Correspondence Between Dan 11 and 1 Macc 1.

Sequence of Events	References from Daniel 11	References from 1 Maccabees
Rise of Antiochus Epiphanes	11:20-24	1:10
Jewish Apostates	11:30	1:11-15
Antiochus Conquers Egypt	11:25-28	1:16-19
Antiochus Conquers Israel	11:31	1:20-40
Antiochus Persecutes Practice of Jewish Customs	11:32-35	1:41-53
Antiochus Defiles Temple	11:31	1:54-64

In view of the similarity between the two accounts, it is likely that the writer of 1 Maccabees structured his account according to the pattern of Daniel’s prophecy, even employing the same expression βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως to describe the desecration of Antiochus’ forces at the Jerusalem temple. It is also remarkable that in the expression used in 1 Macc 1:54, βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως, ἐρήμωσις is both singular and anarthrous, following a similar usage in Dan 11:31 (and not Dan 9:27; 12:11). If βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως in 1 Macc 1:54 does refer to a pagan altar

superimposed upon the altar of burnt offerings at the Jerusalem temple, the question of why this strange expression was used remains. The most devastating act among Antiochus' list of odious offences against the Jews and their deity is undeniably the desecration of the temple and the introduction of pagan worship in the temple. βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως therefore simultaneously represented the pinnacle of Antiochus' atrocities, as well as the nadir of Jewish persecution. βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως is a symbolic circumlocution rather than a physical description, and the expression can only be found in Daniel, 1 Maccabees, and subsequently, in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. Various proposals have been offered for why this term was originally used in Daniel.¹¹ Some scholars maintain that it is a derogatory wordplay on the name of the deity whose altar Antiochus erected in the Jewish temple.¹² Others contend that ἐρήμωσις "to be desolate" was not the best translation for the Hebrew word שַׁמָּה, and that the definition of "to be appalled" should be applied instead. In their view, הַשְׁקִיף מְשֻׁמָּה should really be translated "the appalling abomination" instead of "the desolating abomination".¹³ And finally, the meaning of an abomination that causes the temple to be desolate also makes sense in the context of Antiochus' desecration and injunction against offering regular sacrifices to God. Whichever the case, βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως represents an unspeakable horror brought about by foreign invasion and pagan defilement of what is held sacred by the Jewish people. The writer of Daniel, and subsequently, the writer of 1 Maccabees, drawing upon the text of Daniel, employed the expression to refer to Antiochus' actions. Similarly, the writers of the Gospels of Matthew and

¹¹ See discussion in J. R. Bartlett, *1 Maccabees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 64.

¹² D. Wenham, "Abomination of Desolations" in *ABD 1* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 29.

¹³ Bartlett, *1 Maccabees*, 65.

Mark used the expression to refer to the various Roman threats in the first century C.E.¹⁴ It is noteworthy that Josephus takes Daniel's prophecy to refer to both the exploits of Antiochus and the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E, because it demonstrates that at least some Jewish writers viewed the expression as having multiple referents. Josephus writes, "And indeed it so came to pass, that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel's vision, and what he wrote many years before they came to pass. In the very same manner Daniel also wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made desolate by them." (*Ant.* 10:276) From Josephus' comments it can be seen that the vision in Daniel was used by certain writers as an open-ended prophecy that can be applied to various situations.¹⁵ David Wenham argues that the 'Maccabean experience' was very influential to a variety of Jews in the first century C.E. because it instilled courage and faith in the midst of "idolatrous attacks on the people and temple of God."¹⁶ For this reason, the sections of Daniel that addressed these issues were both popular and influential. The writer of 1 Maccabees most likely borrowed the Danielic expression βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως because Daniel was already well known, and by using the same language, the writer is simply making use of an expression that is not only meaningful and applicable to his situation but also familiar to his audience.

2.2.2.2.2 1 Macc 2:59-60

“Ανανίας, Αζαρίας, Μισαηλ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογός. Δανιηλ ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι αὐτοῦ ἐρρύσθη ἐκ στόματος λεόντων.”

¹⁴ In 49-50 C.E. the emperor Caligula threatened to place his image in the Jerusalem temple. In 70 C.E. the temple along with the rest of Jerusalem was destroyed in the Roman siege under Titus. See also J. G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 39.

¹⁵ See also Wenham, "Abomination of Desolations", 30.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 29.

1 Maccabees 2:49-70 narrates the account of the death of Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabees, and the founder of the Maccabean resistance. Before his death, he gives final instructions to his sons and blesses them. The speech, found in vv. 49-68, is an appeal to “show zeal for the law, and give your lives for the covenant of our ancestors.”¹⁷ Mattathias exhorts his sons to “remember the deeds of the ancestors”¹⁸, and gives a list of faithful ancestors along with their attributes and achievements. Mattathias lists Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Caleb, David, Elijah, as well as characters from the Book of Daniel: Hananiah, Azariah, Mischael, and Daniel. In 1 Macc 2:59, Mattathias admires the courageous act of faith (πιστεύσαντες) of Daniel’s companions in the face of death, alluding to the tale found in Dan 3 where Hananiah, Azariah and Mischael¹⁹ were thrown into a blazing furnace for refusing to worship Nebuchadnezzar’s golden statue. They were faithful to the end and were miraculously protected and delivered from harm. It is remarkable that while Mattathias alludes to the story of the burning furnace found in Dan 3, the names he uses for Daniel’s companions are the Hebrew form of the names, which do not appear in Dan 3 but are only found in Dan 1:6—7, 11, 19 and 2:17. The names used for the protagonists in Dan 3, in both the LXX and MT versions, are Shadrach (שַׁדְרָךְ), Meshach (מִשְׁכַּח), and Abednego (עֲבֵד־נֶגוֹ)—Chaldean names given to them in Dan 1. There can be several explanations for this phenomenon; the writer of 1 Maccabees was also familiar with other parts of Daniel (chapter 1 as well as chapter 3—and as we will see shortly, chapter 6), or the names of these revered characters from the Book of Daniel were used interchangeably due to the prevalence

¹⁷ 1 Macc 2:50.

¹⁸ 1 Macc 2:51.

¹⁹ Referred to by their Chaldean names, Shadrach (Hananiah), Abednego (Azariah), and Meschach (Mischael) in the Dan 3 account in both the LXX and MT versions.

of the Danielic tradition and thus the audience's familiarity with the Danielic tradition could be assumed. Both of these arguments rely on a formidable familiarity with the book of Daniel which is supported by the context of the Danielic allusion in Mattathias' speech. The aim of Mattathias' discourse is to inspire his sons by naming great figures from Israel's past—the names of Hananiah, Azariah, and Mischael appear alongside an impressive list of notable heroes that includes Abraham, David, and Elijah. It is the opinion of the writer of Maccabees that Hananiah, Azariah, Mischael and their story of courageous faith are to be included into Israel's great tradition of heroes.²⁰ This suggests that book of Daniel which is the only text where the story of Hananiah, Azariah, and Mischael can be found must also have been widely read by the contemporary audience of 1 Maccabees.

The figure of Daniel, after whom the book was named, is also included in the list of Israel's great figures in Mattathias' prayer. Daniel who was delivered from the mouth of lions is praised for his innocence, which can also be translated as integrity (ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι αὐτοῦ).²¹ The account of Daniel and his deliverance from the den of lions is found in sixth chapter of Daniel. The adjective ἀπλότης is never used to describe Daniel throughout the book of Daniel, but is rather the writer of 1 Maccabees' own description and interpretation of Daniel's story. ἀπλότης appears one other time in 1 Macc 2:37 to describe the innocence of those who had taken to the hills to escape the king's enforced sacrifices: “λέγοντες Ἀποθάνωμεν πάντες ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι ἡμῶν· μαρτυρεῖ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ ὅτι ἀκρίτως ἀπόλλυτε ἡμᾶς.” The captured men are innocent, and so even “heaven and earth” will testify on their behalf that they have been unjustly killed. It can be seen that

²⁰ Bartlett compares this list with the praises of famous men in Ecclesiasticus 44-50, and the heroes of faith in Hebrews 11; *1 Maccabees*, 67.

²¹ 1 Macc 2:60.

ἀπλότης is a term that the writer of 1 Maccabees' uses and applies to Daniel's story of being unjustly thrown into the lions' den. Given the writer of 1 Maccabees knowledge of the legend of Daniel, positive estimation of the figure of Daniel, and the use of alternate names, the book of Daniel was probably already highly influential at the time 1 Maccabees was written. That the writer of 1 Maccabees included these characters from the Book of Daniel in Mattathias' prayer demonstrates that these Danielic legends were not only widely circulated by the end of the second century B.C.E., but they were also widely accepted by certain Jews to be authoritative legends and as examples worthy to be followed.

2.2.3. 3 Maccabees

2.2.3.1 Contents

3 Maccabees is an extended narrative that supposedly took place during the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator of Egypt around 217 B.C.E.²² It narrates the tale of Philopator, who becomes so enraged that he is denied access to the Jerusalem temple that he decides to exterminate all Jews in his kingdom by forcing them into Alexandria and putting them to death via a coordinated elephant stampede. These unfortunate Jews pray for deliverance from Philopator's unjust wrath and by divine intervention the elephants turn on Philopator's troops and destroy them instead of the Jews. The episode concludes with the Philopator acknowledging the Jewish God, providing for Jewish celebrations, and safely returning the Jews back to their homes. This tale resembles the story of Esther, as well as various other stories from the Book of Daniel, where a foreign king seeks to persecute Jewish figures, but after

²² This is the date when Philopator defeats Antiochus III at the battle of Raphia, an event which is mentioned at the introduction of 3 Maccabees.

witnessing divine intervention, the king instead acknowledges the God of the Jews and makes amends by not only rewarding the Jews but also by punishing the enemies of the Jews.

2.2.3.2. Functions

2.2.3.2.1. 3 Macc 6:6-7

“σὺ τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν τρεῖς ἑταίρους πυρὶ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐθαιρέτως δεδωκότας εἰς τὸ μὴ λατρεῦσαι τοῖς κενοῖς διάπυρον δροσίσας κάμινον ἑρρύσω μέχρι τριχὸς ἀπημάντους φλόγα πᾶσιν ἐπιπέμψας τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις. σὺ τὸν διαβολαῖς φθόνου λέουσι κατὰ γῆς ῥιφέντα θηρσὶν βορὰν Δανιηλ εἰς φῶς ἀνήγαγες ἄσινῃ.”

The reference to Daniel appears at a climactic moment in the story of 3 Maccabees. The Jews have been gathered into the stadium (ἵππόδρομος)²³ to be slaughtered by a herd of elephants from the king’s militia. The king, after various delays, has finally resolved to carry out his plan to destroy the Jews, and the elephants led by the king’s army begin to charge.²⁴ At the very last moment, Eleazar, a renowned and virtuous elderly priest, prays to God on behalf of his people.²⁵ In his prayer, Eleazar petitions God by recalling various scenes from Israel’s history where God delivers his people out of harm from foreign powers. His prayer begins by mentioning God’s deliverance of Israel from a Pharaoh of Egypt (v. 4), Sennacherib of Assyria (v. 5), the deliverance of Daniel and his companions from various persecutions in Babylon (vv. 6-7), and the deliverance of Jonah from the sea monster (v.8). Eleazar pleads with God to save his people from harm so that the Gentiles may know that he has the power to save Israel (v. 13). God listens to Eleazar’s prayer, and the elephants

²³ 3 Macc 5:46.

²⁴ 3 Macc 5:42-47.

²⁵ 3 Macc 6:1-15.

trample Philopator's army instead. The Jewish people are saved, the Egyptian king acknowledges Israel's God, and those who apostatized are severely punished.

The reference to the stories of Daniel and his companions is similar to the reference found in 1 Macc 2:59-60, discussed above. References, albeit with some varying details, are made to the same two stories: The Companions in the Fiery Furnace (Dan 3) and Daniel and the Lions' Den (Dan 6). Contrary to 1 Maccabees, the names of Daniel's companions are not mentioned in 3 Maccabees, they are only referred to as τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν τρεῖς ἑταίρους (the three companions in Babylon). Whereas in 1 Maccabees they are praised for their faith, the focus in 3 Macc 6:6 is the willing sacrifice of the three men and God's act of deliverance. The writer of 3 Maccabees also alludes to the element of the story in Dan 3 wherein the flames of the furnace devour the men who threw Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego into it. This motif of God punishing the enemy with the same device that the enemy intended to use against the righteous Jews can often be observed in Jewish legends and is in fact what unfolds in the narrative of 3 Maccabees.²⁶ The elephant brigade does not attack the Jews, but instead turns back and destroys Philopator's army.²⁷ In Daniel the king witnesses the divine deliverance and recants, and here Philopator demands the release of the Jews and acknowledges and praises the God of the Jews.²⁸ The allusion to the story in Dan 3 even includes the detail about the hair of the men not being harmed (ἐρρύσω μέχρι τριχὸς ἀπημάντους).²⁹ The reference goes beyond the episode narrated in Dan 3, however, when the writer claims that God moistened the furnace with dew (δροσίζω). This detail is not found in the MT

²⁶ E.g. Daniel's accusers are thrown into the lions' den in Dan 6; In Esther 9:25, Haman and his sons are hanged on the very gallows he had intended for Mordecai, etc.

²⁷ 3 Macc 6:21.

²⁸ 3 Macc 6:27-28; 7:6-9.

²⁹ Dan 3:94 [LXX], Dan 3:27 [MT].

version of Dan 3 but is found in the additions to Daniel in Dan 3:50 (LXX), suggesting that perhaps the author was dependent on the LXX version of Daniel.³⁰ Generally speaking, Eleazar's descriptions are more detailed than the references found in Mattathias' prayer, as is consistent with the flowery language used by the writer of 3 Maccabees throughout the entirety of the book. Likewise, the following reference to the story of Daniel in the lion's den in 3 Macc 6:7 also bears the marks of the writer's descriptive style. As before, the emphasis is still on God's deliverance; however, Daniel is described as one who is "thrown down into the ground to lions as food for wild animals" but is "brought up to the light unharmed". These narrative embellishments, while they are vivid and effective, are products of the literary technique of the writer of 3 Maccabees. It is important to note that while there is some innovation in the retelling of Daniel's story, the most important elements of the story remain unchanged: Daniel is thrown into the lion's den because of slander and God delivers him to safety. The allusions to the stories of Daniel and his companions are included in Eleazar's petition to God because they belong to a tradition of stories about God's deliverance of his faithful servants. It is significant that Eleazar appeals to God's own faithfulness for deliverance and not to the merits of the Jewish people.³¹ The references to the stories in Daniel seem to have been selected primarily because they are familiar examples of God's divine deliverance. The deliverance of Daniel and his companions may be understood as representing God's protection of Israel in Babylon, because their deliverance is listed alongside God's deliverance of Israel from Egypt and Assyria. Similarly to the argument made above regarding Mattathias' use of the Danielic references in his final words to his

³⁰ Daniel 3:50 = Pr Azar 27. See also N. C. Croy, *3 Maccabees* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 100.

³¹ 3 Macc 6:10-15.

sons, Eleazar's use of these particular examples from the Book of Daniel in the most important prayer, at the most crucial point in the narrative, again demonstrates that these stories were widely circulated and generally held to be true and authoritative.

2.2.4. 4 Maccabees

2.2.4.1 Contents

4 Maccabees is a document that praises “devout reason” (ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός) over passions (το πάθος) by dramatically narrating at length the grisly martyrdom of Eleazar and the seven brothers and their mother by Antiochus Epiphanes. The writer's aim is show the supremacy of reason by demonstrating that the martyrs' “devout reason” enabled them to stay true to God amidst death, preceded by horrific physical tortures. David A. De Silva notes that “the author of 4 Maccabees was clearly a devotee of Hellenistic philosophy...[drawing] upon a wide range of philosophical traditions, combining them skilfully to serve his purpose and shaping them to accommodate traditional Jewish anthropology and theology.”³² 4 Maccabees greatly expands upon the same accounts of Eleazar and the seven brothers' and their mother's martyrdom in 2 Macc 6:18-7:42, and is postulated to be written around 50 C.E.

2.2.4.2. Functions

2.2.4.2.1. 4 Macc 16:3

“καὶ οὐχ οὕτως οἱ περὶ Δανιηλ λέοντες ἦσαν ἄγριοι οὐδὲ ἡ Μισαηλ ἐκφλεγόμενη κάμιнос λαβροτάτῳ πυρί, ὥς ἡ τῆς φιλοτεκνίας περιέκαιεν ἐκείνην φύσις ὁρώσαν αὐτῆς οὕτως ποικίλως βασανιζομένους τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ υἱούς.”

³² D. A. De Silva, *4 Maccabees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 13.

In 4 Macc 8-12, Antiochus Epiphanes tortures and kills seven Jewish brothers while their mother is forced to watch because the brothers refuse to eat ritually unclean food. In 4 Maccabees 14-16, the writer explores the sentiments of the mother and praises her for demonstrating “devout reason”, which enabled her “to endure to see her children’s torments unto death”.³³ The references to Daniel, specifically the tale of Daniel and the lions’ den and the tale of the companions in the furnace, are used to illustrate the severity of the suffering that the mother experienced in having to witness the torture of her children. The writer muses that the savagery of the lions (λέοντες ἦσαν ἄγριοι) that Daniel faced and the violence of the flames (λαβροτάτῳ πυρί) Mischael encountered in the furnace pale in comparison to the anguish the mother must have felt because of the love she had for her children (τῆς φιλοτεκνίας). The tales of Daniel are referenced here because they are familiar examples of persecution.³⁴ There is mention neither of their virtues nor eventual deliverance by God. The text is only focused on the adversity they faced. Daniel is mentioned by name, as one would expect, in relation to the lions, but Mischael is the only figure of the three companions named. There is some elaboration beyond the text of Dan 3 and 6 in the description of their adversity, the lions are wild and the flames are violent, but apart from this, the references made to Daniel are only made in passing to draw attention to the greater anguish of the mother, which she overcomes by means of her “devout reason”: “ἀλλὰ τῷ λογισμῷ τῆς εὐσεβείας κατέσβεσεν τὰ τοσαῦτα καὶ τηλικαῦτα πάθη ἡ μήτηρ.”³⁵ The function of the

³³ 4 Macc 6:1.

³⁴ D. A. De Silva, *4 Maccabees*, 100-101, suggests that texts such as Dan 3, 6; 2 Macc 6:18-31; 7; 4 Macc; and some Rabbinic texts such as *b. Ber.* 61b and *b. ‘Abod. Zar.* 17b-18a, belong to a pattern of Jewish martyr stories meant to exhort the audience to remain loyal to their ancestral way of life.

³⁵ 4 Macc 6:4.

Danielic reference is to emphasize the courage of the mother through the embellished comparisons of her suffering with that of the legendary Biblical characters.

2.2.4.2.2. 4 Macc 16:21

“καὶ Δανιηλ ὁ δίκαιος εἰς λέοντας ἐβλήθη, καὶ Ανανίας καὶ Αἰζαρίας καὶ Μισαηλ εἰς κάμινον πυρὸς ἀπεσφενδονήθησαν καὶ ὑπέμειναν διὰ τὸν θεόν.”

The writer continues his praise of the mother, calling her an aged soldier of God of piety (ὦ μήτερ δι' εὐσέβειαν θεοῦ στρατιῶτι πρεσβῦτι) who is stronger than Antiochus through her deeds and words (ἔργοις δυνατωτέρα καὶ λόγοις εὐρέθης ἀνδρός).³⁶ The writer then narrates the mother's words to her sons, supposedly spoken in Hebrew, whilst Eleazar, the old man, was being tortured.³⁷ The mother encourages her sons to follow the example of Eleazar and bear every affliction because of God. She then cites several examples from Israel's tradition where men of faith endure hardships for God: when Abraham is commanded to sacrifice Isaac, when Daniel is thrown to the lions, and when Hananiah, Azariah and Mischael are slung into the fiery furnace.³⁸ The references to the Book of Daniel are the same as those found earlier in the chapter: the two stories of Daniel and the lions and the companions in the furnace. However, in this context, the focus is not on the adversity that Daniel and his companions faced, but rather their faithful endurance. The function of these references, alongside the reference to the account of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac,³⁹ is to serve as worthy examples of men who remained faithful and endured hardships for God. The mother courageously reminds her sons: “For it is unreasonable that they who know religion should not stand up against troubles

³⁶ 4 Macc 4:14.

³⁷ 4 Macc 16:16-25.

³⁸ 4 Macc 16:21.

³⁹ The account of God commanding Abraham to sacrifice Isaac is found in Gen 22.

(ἀλόγιστον γὰρ εἰδότας εὐσέβειαν μὴ ἀνθίστασθαι τοῖς πόνοις).”⁴⁰ Abraham, Daniel, and his companions were men in Israel’s tradition who did stand up against troubles because of their obedience to God. The mother used these examples to bolster the courage of her sons so that they would die rather than violate God’s commandment.⁴¹ Although the references to Daniel are rather brief—they only mention the protagonists’ names and their fates (Daniel is cast to the lions, the companions are thrown into the fiery furnace)—it is noteworthy that Daniel is called “Daniel, the Righteous [One]” (Δανιηλ ὁ δίκαιος). This is not a description which can be found in the Book of Daniel and is likely associated with the traditions that must have circulated concerning the figure of Daniel. In particular, there is an enduring tradition about “the righteous man” in the Wisdom of Solomon and also in the Psalms (Wis 2:12,18; 3:10; 5:11; Pss 1; 37; 75, etc.). The righteous man is persecuted by the wicked, but God will help him and vanquish his enemies. The figure of Daniel, particularly as he is portrayed in Dan 1-6, is a prime example of the righteous man who is persecuted but ultimately vindicated. In light of the similarities between the legends about Daniel, who was persecuted for staying faithful to God, and the pressure faced by many Jews in the Maccabean period, it is unsurprising that the Book of Daniel was such an inspirational text. The fact that references to Daniel can be found in such dramatic and climactic situations in the narrative underscore the text’s importance and influence.

⁴⁰ 4 Macc 16:23.

⁴¹ 4 Macc 16:24.

2.2.4.2.3. 4 Macc 18:12—13

“ἔλεγεν δὲ ὑμῖν τὸν ζηλωτὴν Φινεες, ἐδίδασκέν τε ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐν πυρὶ Ἀνανιαν καὶ Ἀζαριαν καὶ Μισαηλ. ἐδόξαζεν δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐν λάκκῳ λεόντων Δανιηλ, ὃν ἐμακάριζεν.”

Towards the end of 4 Maccabees, the writer (through the voice of the mother) also reveals to the reader some teachings of the father of the seven brothers. The father taught his sons “the law and the prophets” while he was still with them (ὅς ἐδίδασκεν ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας).⁴² The writer then lists the things that the father taught the seven brothers, saying,

He read to you about Abel slain by Cain, and Isaac who was offered as a burnt offering, and about Joseph in prison. He told you of the zeal of Phinehas, and he taught you about Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishaël in the fire. He praised Daniel in the den of the lions and blessed him. He reminded you of the scripture of Isaiah, which says, ‘Even though you go through the fire, the flame shall not consume you.’ He sang to you songs of the psalmist David, who said, ‘Many are the afflictions of the righteous.’ He recounted to you Solomon’s proverb, ‘There is a tree of life for those who do his will.’ He confirmed the query of Ezekiel, ‘Shall these dry bones live?’ For he did not forget to teach you the song that Moses taught, which says, ‘I kill and I make alive: this is your life and the length of your days.’ (4 Macc 18:11-19)

All of the things mentioned in this compendium of Israel’s traditions are highly relevant to the story of the martyrdom of the seven brothers in 4 Maccabees. The figures of Abel, Isaac, and Joseph are mentioned because they represent patriarchs who suffered various kinds of persecution. Phinehas is mentioned as an example of a man who had zeal. The stories of Hananiah, Azariah, and Mischaël in the fire and Daniel in the den of lions are mentioned presumably because they unjustly endured hardships in the spirit of the aforementioned patriarchs.⁴³ Isaiah’s words give

⁴² 4 Macc 18:10-19.

⁴³ The reason “Phinehas and his zeal” interrupts the list of men who suffered for God is because the writer was writing chronologically. The story of Phinehas, in which he kills a Midianite woman with a

courage to those who might actually be tortured by fire (Isa 43:2). The thirty-fourth psalm of David affirms that the righteous will indeed encounter afflictions (Ps 34:19). Solomon's proverb promises a reward for those who do God's will (Prov 11:30). Ezekiel's prophecy of the dry bones gives hope to those who are on the brink of death (Ezek 37:4). The song of Moses maintains that it is God who is ultimately sovereign over life itself (Deut 32:39). The aim of this text in 4 Maccabees is to demonstrate that the father taught his seven sons well and that the courage of the brothers is in keeping with the scriptural tradition of Israel that inspired such faith and confidence. The writer who has so effusively applauded the virtues of the mother for teaching her sons now also attributes the seven brothers' courage to their father's scriptural teaching and instruction.

It is noteworthy that although 'the law and prophets' (τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας) are mentioned as the content of the father's teaching in 4 Macc 18:10, the sequence in 4 Macc 18:11-19 actually mentions figures and texts from all three divisions of the Hebrew Bible: the Law (Abel, Isaac, Joseph, and Moses), the Prophets (Isaiah, Ezekiel), and the Writings (David, Solomon, and Daniel). With regard to the influence of Daniel on 4 Maccabees, it is evident that the Book of Daniel (or at the very least, the legends about Daniel and his companions) was not only popular and influential, but accepted as scripture alongside other notable figures and texts from "the Law and the Prophets". The figure of Daniel, particularly as he is described in the story of the lions' den, is admired by the writer of 4 Maccabees: the father "praised Daniel in the den of lions and blessed" him (ἐδόξαζεν δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐν

spear out of zeal for God (Num 25), precedes the stories of Daniel and his companions, which supposedly happens during the Babylonian exile.

λάκκῳ λεόντων Δανιηλ, ὃν ἐμακάριζεν).⁴⁴ It can be seen that the references to Daniel in 4 Macc 18:12-13 have two primary functions. The stories about Daniel and his companions belong to the greater tradition of Israel's scripture that inspires faith and sacrifice. The writer made this clear by stating that the father taught from the law and the prophets (τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας) and by including the stories of Daniel and his companion among the list of notable figures and scriptures. The other immediate function of the Danielic references is that they provide examples of notable figures who suffered for God, including the patriarchs Abel, Isaac, and Joseph.

2.2.4.3 Summary of the Use of Daniel the Books of Maccabees

In the various references to Daniel in 1, 3, and 4 Maccabees, we have seen that although the same stories of Daniel and the lions' den and the companions in the fiery furnace are retold, each book of Maccabees emphasizes a different element of the story. In 1 Maccabees, Mattathias exhorts his sons to follow the example of Daniel and his companions' unwavering commitment to God. The emphasis is on the faithfulness of Daniel and his companions to God, which is meant to inspire faithfulness to God. 3 Maccabees focuses on God's deliverance, with Mattathias citing Daniel as a precedent of God's divine rescue in a prayer petitioning God's deliverance. The emphasis here is on the faithfulness of God, which is meant to inspire confidence in God's salvation. In 4 Maccabees, the writer emphasizes the severity of the adversity Daniel and his companions endured and the fact that they belonged to the greater tradition of Israel's martyrs. The emphasis here is on the suffering experienced by Daniel and his companions, and the rhetorical function of

⁴⁴4 Macc 6:13.

the allusion is predicated on the audience's acceptance of the legends of Daniel as being authoritative and true. The focus and emphasis of the allusions shifts depending upon the writer's own literary aims, from human loyalty to God to God's own faithfulness and finally, to the suffering of the righteous. What is common among these different uses is that the stories of Daniel that are retold are viewed as an essential part of Israel's tradition. In other words, although different elements of the stories are emphasized at different times, the literary function of the references, broadly speaking, is an appeal to the authority of scripture. This is evident from the juxtaposition of the Danielic references alongside references to other authoritative figures and scriptural references. The specific function of each Danielic reference depends entirely on the requirements of the particular literary context (i.e., in Mattathias' speech, the function of the reference was exhortation, but in the narrator's speech in 4 Maccabees, the function was to emphasize the mother's suffering); however, the extent to which these references are able to function is based upon the assumption that the Book of Daniel was viewed as scripture. It has also been seen that even though the various writers allude to Daniel as scripture, they were also free to embellish and enhance the Danielic accounts with details that are not found in the original texts. This may be because these elements are details associated with those Danielic stories in the writer's own community or because these elaborations further appropriate the Danielic stories to the writer's purposes (i.e., in wanting to compare the innocence of Daniel (1 Macc 2:60) with the Jewish martyrs in 1 Macc 2:3-7).

2.2.5. The Apocalypse of Ezra (4 Ezra)

2.2.5.1. *Contents*

The Apocalypse of Ezra, also called the Second Book of Esdras, is a Jewish apocalypse written after the destruction of Jerusalem towards the end of the 1st century C.E.⁴⁵ The original Hebrew text has been lost, and the most important witnesses to the book are in Latin (through the Vulgate) and in Syriac (in the Ambrosian codex of the Peshitta).⁴⁶ 4 Ezra is comprised of seven visions that are pseudonymously attributed to the figure of Ezra and the overall message is a theological response to the crisis of the destruction of Jerusalem. Tom W. Willet suggests that 4 Ezra should be understood as a narrative theodicy, an attempt to explain the Jewish tragedy via the character of Ezra.⁴⁷ Despite what has happened, Israel has not been forsaken and will be vindicated by God. The following analyses of 4 Ezra will be based on the English NRSV version, a translation that relies heavily on the Latin version.

2.2.5.2. *Functions*

The references to Daniel in 4 Ezra are found in the vision of the eagle given to Ezra in 4 Ezra 11:1-12:3,⁴⁸ the request for an interpretation in verses 12:4-9, and the interpretation of the vision by the angel in 12:10-38. The reference to Daniel is made explicit in the angel's interpretation of the vision in 12:11, where the eagle in Ezra's vision is interpreted to be "the fourth kingdom which appeared in vision to thy

⁴⁵ Based on the primary importance of the destruction of Jerusalem to the book (it must have been written after the event), and a citation in the *Epistle of Barnabas* at the beginning of the second century C.E. See Stone, M. E. *Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 9-10.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 1-8.

⁴⁷ T. W. Willet, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 51.

⁴⁸ In the NRSV, 4 Ezra is known as 2 Esdras, but for the sake of consistency, the name "4 Ezra" will be used in the following analysis.

brother Daniel.” Stone considers this “an explicit reference to Daniel 7”,⁴⁹ and believes that the “general inspiration of this vision is drawn, of course, from Daniel 7”.⁵⁰

The “fourth kingdom” is mentioned in two parallel accounts in the Book of Daniel: in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the statue in Dan 2 and in Daniel’s vision of the four beasts in Dan 7.⁵¹ In both accounts, the “fourth kingdom” is symbolized by a striking image. In Dan 2 the “fourth kingdom” is represented by the legs of a statue made of different materials that are described as being “as strong as iron”, and the legs are described as something that “crushes and smashes everything”.⁵² In Dan 7 the “fourth kingdom” is represented by the fourth and final beast which “had great iron teeth and was devouring, breaking in pieces, and stamping what was left with its feet.”⁵³ The “fourth kingdom” in both accounts refers to a future foreign power that will overcome and dominate the three preceding kingdoms, but which will ultimately be vanquished by the kingdom of God. This kingdom of God is represented by the imagery of “the stone that has not been cut by human hands” in Dan 2:34-36 and the “one like a son of man” in Dan 7:13-14. In the vision of 4 Ezra 11:1-12:3, Ezra beholds an eagle with twelve feathered wings and three heads that holds dominance over the earth. The wings and heads represent various kings in Ezra’s vision and are strikingly similar to the wings, heads, and horns found in Daniel’s vision: “After this, as I watched, another appeared, like a leopard. The beast had four wings of a bird on

⁴⁹ Stone, *4 Ezra*, 345.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 348.

⁵¹ For more examples of the concept of the four worldly kingdoms in Jewish Apocalyptic materials, see P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1934), 311.

⁵² Dan 2:40.

⁵³ Dan. 7:7.

its back and four heads; and dominion was given to it.”⁵⁴ Although the account in 4 Ezra 11:1-34 is a rather detailed account of the various heads and wings of the eagle, representing the fourth kingdom,⁵⁵ the parallel with Dan 2 and 7 is unmistakable. Ezra hears what is described as a lion speaking with a man’s voice and addressing the eagle it says,

You, the fourth that has come, have conquered all the beasts that have gone before; and you have held sway over the world with great terror, and over all the earth with grievous oppression; and for so long you have lived on the earth with deceit. You have judged the earth, but not with truth, for you have oppressed the meek and injured the peaceable; you have hated those who tell the truth, and have loved liars; you have destroyed the homes of those who brought forth fruit, and have laid low the walls of those who did you no harm. (4 Ezra 11:40-42)

And in verse 45, the lion pronounces the doom of the eagle, saying

Therefore you, eagle, will surely disappear, you and your terrifying wings, your most evil little wings, your malicious heads, your most evil talons, and your whole worthless body, so that the whole earth, freed from your violence, may be refreshed and relieved, and may hope for the judgment and mercy of him who made it. (4 Ezra 11:45-46)

After the lion spoke these words, the eagle is completely destroyed, beginning with its head, its wings, and then its body. It is noteworthy that 4 Ezra 12:3 mentions that the “whole body of the eagle was burnt.” This detail bears a striking resemblance to the fate of the fourth beast in Dan 7:11: “And as I watched, the beast was put to death, and its body destroyed and given over to be burned with fire.” The import of this similarity will be seen later, but for the time being it is sufficient to note that the vision ends with the destruction of the “fourth kingdom”. Just as Daniel reacted to his vision,⁵⁶ Ezra is shaken by the dream and requests an interpretation from the

⁵⁴ Dan 7:6.

⁵⁵ There is also a detailed description of the fourth beast in Daniel’s vision, see Dan 7:7-8.

⁵⁶ “As for me, Daniel, my spirit was troubled within me, and the visions of my head terrified me. I approached one of the attendants to ask him the truth concerning all this.” Dan 7:15-16.

angel.⁵⁷ In the interpretation of the dream, Ezra is told that the eagle is the fourth kingdom that appeared in a vision to “your brother Daniel”,⁵⁸ but with the qualification that this was a new interpretation of the fourth kingdom that is different from Daniel’s. The wings and the heads of the eagle symbolize various kings vying for power (vv. 11:13-30), and the roaring lion from the wood is a Davidic Messiah:

[T]his is the Messiah whom the Most High has kept until the end of days, who will arise from the offspring of David, and will come and speak with them. He will denounce them for their ungodliness and for their wickedness, and will display before them their contemptuous dealings. For first he will bring them alive before his judgment seat, and when he has reproved them, then he will destroy them. (4 Ezra 12:32-33)

There are some noticeable differences between Ezra’s vision and those of Daniel in Dan 2 and 7, but there remains a strong parallel in the framework of the vision. Amidst the elaborate details in Ezra’s depiction of the eagle which represents the ‘fourth kingdom’ is the element that God has appointed the last of the worldly dominions to rule. In 4 Ezra, it is clear that the destruction of the fourth kingdom is due to its failure to rule faithfully: the fourth kingdom ruled the world with oppression, injustice, fraud, and a lack of faithfulness.⁵⁹ In 4 Ezra, God grants unsurpassed political might to the fourth kingdom, and the failure to rule responsibly results in divine judgment.

The roaring lion, an explicit messianic symbol in 4 Ezra, is also analogous to the symbols of God’s kingdom in Dan 2 (the rock not cut by human hands) and Dan 7 (the one like a son of man). Although the writer states that his interpretation of the fourth kingdom is different from that of Daniel’s (12:12), the vision of Ezra is clearly dependent on the earlier accounts found in Daniel, of which the writer is clearly

⁵⁷ 4 Ezra 12:5-9.

⁵⁸ 4 Ezra 12:11.

⁵⁹ 4 Ezra 11:40-41.

cognizant. There are three observable parallels between the two that further strengthen the case for interdependence: the might of the fourth kingdom, its dominance over the other kingdoms, and its eventual displacement by divine rule. There are also additional parallels between the vision of 4 Ezra and Dan 7. The setting and the language used resemble that of the vision in Dan 7. Both visions happen in the context of a dream at night (4 Ezra 11:1/Dan 7:2). Even the content of the visions is similar, consisting of symbolic representations of earthly kingdoms that will be deposed and replaced by the reign of God's kingdom (4 Ezra 11:1-12:3a/Dan 7:2-14). The seer is terrified by the vision, requests an interpretation, and is granted one (4 Ezra 12:7-39/Dan 7:16-28). There are further parallels between the vision of 4 Ezra and the larger corpus of Daniel as well. The appellation of God 'Most High', a title consistently used in 4 Ezra where it appears sixty-eight times, is also frequently used to describe God in Daniel where it appears fourteen times. At the conclusion of the interpretation, Ezra is praised for being worthy to learn the secret of the Most High. He is told,

And you alone were worthy to learn this secret of the Most High. Therefore write all these things that you have seen in a book, put it in a hidden place; and you shall teach them to the wise among your people, whose hearts you know are able to comprehend and keep these secrets. (4 Ezra 12:36-38)

Here, too, the similarities between the figure of Ezra and Daniel are striking. In the Book of Daniel, the figure of Daniel is seen as a wise man to whom God reveals mysteries, as can be observed in texts such as Dan 2:47: "The king said to Daniel, 'Truly, your God is God of gods and Lord of kings and a revealer of mysteries, for you have been able to reveal this mystery!'" and Dan 4:9: "O Belteshazzar, chief of the magicians, I know that you are endowed with a spirit of the holy gods and that no

mystery is too difficult for you. Hear the dream that I saw; tell me its interpretation.”⁶⁰ God is the “revealer of mysteries”, and Daniel is praised as a kind of ‘revealer’ as well, since he is the human recipient of that revelation who is able to share it with mankind. In 4 Ezra 12:36, Ezra has also been found worthy to learn “the mysteries of the Most High”. In Dan 12:4, Daniel is told to “keep the words secret and the book sealed until the time of the end” and in parallel Ezra is also commanded to write revelations and to hide the book.⁶¹ Ezra is commanded to teach these things to the wise of the people “whose hearts you know are able to comprehend and keep these secrets.”⁶² The phrase ‘the wise’ refers to an exemplary group who are featured in the Book of Daniel. In Dan 11:33, “The wise among the people shall give understanding to many...”⁶³ Dan 12:3 foretells the destiny of these ‘wise people’, who will “shine like the brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever.” And again in Dan 12:10 the ‘wise people’ are mentioned: “None of the wicked shall understand, but those who are wise shall understand.” In light of the parallels that have already been observed, the reference to “the wise of the people” in 4 Ezra is best understood in the context of “the wise among the people” described in Daniel.

Despite these similarities, the two texts are by no means identical; there are numerous differences. Details in 4 Ezra are elaborated and embellished far beyond the original references in Daniel. But to what extent were these elaborations and embellishments an interpretation of the Danielic vision and to what extent were they new ideas? Of particular import to this dissertation is the parallel of the roaring lion

⁶⁰ See also Dan 2:18-19, 27, 30.

⁶¹ 4 Ezra 12:36.

⁶² 4 Ezra 12:38.

⁶³ Italics mine.

in 4 Ezra and the “one like of a son of man” figure in Dan 7. Is the messianic aspect of the roaring lion an invention of the writer of 4 Ezra 11 or is it an interpretation of what is already implicit in Dan 7? The details describing the lion as “a messiah from the seed of David” whom the “Most High” kept until the end of days goes well beyond the descriptions of the ‘one like a son of man’ figure.

In the vision of Daniel in Dan 7:11-14, it appears that the destruction of the fourth beast happens before the coming of the ‘one like a son of man’ figure. It is only after the destruction of all the beasts that the ‘one like a son of man’ figure appears and is given dominion. Therefore, it appears as though the ‘one like a son of man’ figure has no judicial functions. However, in the explanation of the vision in Dan 7:21-22, the “holy ones of the Most High” who the ‘one like a son of man’ figure symbolizes are given the authority to judge. The LXX reads in Dan 7:22: καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῦ ὑψίστου, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἐδόθη καὶ τὸ βασίλειον κατέσχον οἱ ἅγιοι. This is a fairly literal translation of the Aramaic: ודינא יהב לקדישי עליונים. The responsibility and the authority to judge were given to “the holy ones of the Most High”.⁶⁴ A similar usage of the noun κρίσις (Θ: κρίμα) with the verb δίδωμι and a dative indirect object can be found in both John 5:22 and Rev 20:4 in the New Testament. In John 5:22, the Greek reads: οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκεν τῷ υἱῷ... (For the Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the son). The father giving all judgment to the son should be understood as bestowing the responsibility or the role of judging on the son. And similarly, in Rev 20:4, Καὶ εἶδον θρόνους καὶ ἐκάθισαν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς καὶ κρίμα ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς... (And I saw thrones and they sat on them and

⁶⁴ Dan 7:22.

judgment was given to them). Again, as in the previous example, “judgment was given to them” should be understood as ‘the authority to judge was given to them’. Given these examples, it appears that the grammatical construction of κρίσις/κρίμα, δίδωμι and a dative indirect object can refer to the conferral of judicial authority to a person or persons. Consequently, even though the ‘one like a son of man’ figure in Daniel has no apparent judicial functions, ‘the holy ones of the Most High’ do have such a function. The writer of 4 Ezra, perhaps because he is aware of the holy ones’ roles in judgment, may well have attributed the judicial functions to the messiah figure in his vision narrative. The lion in 4 Ezra has a vital role to play in the judgment of the kingdoms because it is by his words and rebuke that the eagle is judged and destroyed: “For at the first he shall set them alive for judgment; and when he hath rebuked them he shall destroy them.”⁶⁵ The judicial function of the messiah figure is also emphasized in the New Testament, particularly in the Gospel of Matthew. In Matt 19:28, Jesus tells his disciples that “at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man is seated on the throne of his glory, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” Here, the disciples will participate in the action of judging the tribes of Israel with the Son of Man.⁶⁶

In addition to the judicial functions mentioned above, the writer of 4 Ezra also attributes the title of Messiah to the roaring lion. In Dan 7, the ‘one like a son of man’ figure is not explicitly messianic, although one might argue that the literary context allows for such an interpretation. The four beasts in the vision of Dan 7 not

⁶⁵ 4 Ezra 12:33.

⁶⁶ Matt 24:30-31, 44. The Matthean Son of Man has specific functions: he will send his angels to gather the elect, with his coming will be judgment, like the coming of the deluge in the time of Noah, etc. See also Luke 22:30.

only symbolize kingdoms, but more specifically, the kings that represent those kingdoms. In the angel's interpretation of the vision, he explains, "As for these four great beasts, four kings shall arise out of the earth."⁶⁷ It stands to reason that the 'one like a son of man' also refers to a kingly figurehead of Israel, in addition to representing the kingdom of Israel. Although this point is only implied in Daniel's vision, the writer of 4 Ezra's interpretation takes it one step further and makes the connection explicit, explaining that not only is the lion the messiah, he is one who will "spring from the seed of David".

In the vision of the eagle in 4 Ezra, there are so many allusions to Daniel, including an explicit reference, that determining the function of these allusions is a complex task. The entire vision of the eagle appears to be an adaptation of the vision of Dan 7; it retains the general framework while adding new details and further elaborating some of the original details. The writer of 4 Ezra simultaneously acknowledges that the eagle refers to the fourth kingdom in Daniel and declares that this is a new explanation.⁶⁸ In other words, there is both continuity and discontinuity in the use of the Danielic vision. The writer of 4 Ezra takes the vision of Daniel and re-interprets the vision with new insights based on his background and literary aims. However, in using such similar language to Daniel and following the framework of the vision of Daniel so closely, one can posit that the writer might have wished for his text to be understood as corresponding to Daniel's prophecy and perhaps sharing its authority. Seen in this light, the Danielic allusions and references in this text function as an indirect appeal to scriptural authority by re-interpreting and adapting a known text for a later audience. The writer of 4 Ezra, while elaborating and

⁶⁷ Dan 7:17.

⁶⁸ 4 Ezra 12:12.

expanding on the vision of Dan 7, understood his own vision to be compatible with the already-authoritative text of Daniel. Stone observes that “although the Book of Daniel was probably regarded as scripture by the author of 4 Ezra, his attitude toward it was not exegetical. Indeed, he claims that his vision here supersedes Daniel’s.”⁶⁹ From this it can be observed that a writer’s reverence for his source text does not necessarily prevent him from making new connections and re-interpreting well-known visions in a new light.

2.2.6. The *Similitudes* of Enoch

2.2.6.1. *Contents*

The *Similitudes* of Enoch, also known as the Book of Parables, refers to chapters 37-71 in the First Book of Enoch, which is a large collection of writings containing revelations from the legendary figure of Enoch. The *Similitudes* narrate Enoch’s heavenly journey and the visions and interpretations of visions he receives concerning the coming judgment of God. The current consensus for the date of composition for this text is some time between 50 B.C.E. and 75 C.E. The only extant manuscripts are an Ethiopic translation of a Greek translation of Aramaic originals.⁷⁰ The following analyses will be based on the English translation from J. C. Charlesworth’s *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*.⁷¹

2.2.6.2. *Functions*

The visions of Enoch about the coming judgment of God feature a heavenly figure who has the dual function of providing eschatological judgment and the vindication of the righteous. The figure is known in the text as the “[Great] Holy One” (*1 En* 1:3;

⁶⁹ Stone, *4 Ezra*, 366.

⁷⁰ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “First Book of Enoch” in the *ABD* 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 509-17.

⁷¹ *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*, vol. 1, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983).

93:11; 97:6), “the Righteous One” (*I En* 38:2; 98:3), “that Son of Man” (*I En* 48:2; 62:5; 62:9, 14; 63:11; 69:26, 29; 71:17), “the Chosen One” (*I En* 48:6), and the “His Messiah” (*I En* 48:10; 52:4). Nickelsburg considers these descriptions to be “the fruit of speculations on the biblical texts about ‘one like a son of man’ (Daniel 7), the Deutero-Isaianic servant of the Lord (especially Isa 42, 49, 52–53), and the Davidic king (Ps 2 and Isa 11)”⁷². However, in this study, the analysis will be restricted to the texts regarding the ‘one like a son of man’. This figure is portrayed as a human agent of God’s eschatological judgment and vindication, and in the unexpected conclusion of the *Similitudes*, Enoch himself is revealed as the Son of Man figure who ascends into the heavens before the Ancient One:⁷³ “Then an angel came to me and greeted me and said to me, ‘You, son of man, who art born in righteousness and upon whom righteousness has dwelt, the righteousness of the Antecedent of Time will not forsake you.’” (*I En* 71:14)⁷⁴ J. J. Collins opposes this interpretation and argues that Enoch is not identified as the heavenly figure, opting for the translation “you are a son of man [a human being] who was born to righteousness”.⁷⁵ Others have argued that *I En* 70:3-71:17 is a later addition to the *Similitudes*, suggesting that the original tradition did not conclude by identifying the heavenly figure with Enoch.⁷⁶ However, despite who the Enochic Son of Man refers to, Enoch or otherwise, the fact remains

⁷² Ibid., 512. See also G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity, Expanded Edition* (Harvard Theological Studies 56; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006), 285.

⁷³ So M. Casey, *Son of Man: The interpretation and influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979), 99-12; M. Müller, *Der Ausdruck ‘Menschensohn’ im den Evangelien* (Leiden: Brill, 1984), 67-80.

⁷⁴ Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 50.

⁷⁵ J. J. Collins, “The Son of Man in First Century Judaism,” *NTS* 38 (1992): 448-66.

⁷⁶ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 151-3.

that the *Similitudes* as a whole understand the figure to be a heavenly individual, not simply a symbol representing the people of God.⁷⁷

The expression “that son of man” is used to describe this eschatological figure,⁷⁸ and it is very clear from texts such as *1 En* 46:1-3 that there is a connection between this figure and the ‘one like a son of man’ in Dan 7:

At that place, I saw the One to whom belongs the time before time. And his head was white like wool, and there was with him another individual, whose face was like that of a human being. His countenance was full of grace like that of one among the holy angels. And I asked the one—from among the angels—who was going with me, and who had revealed to me all the secrets regarding the One who was born of human beings, “Who is this, and from whence is he who is going as the prototype of the Before-Time?” And he answered me and said to me, “This is the Son of Man, to whom belongs righteousness, and with whom righteousness dwells. And he will open all the hidden storerooms; for the Lord of the Spirits has chosen him, and he is destined to be victorious before the Lord of the Spirits in eternal uprightness.”⁷⁹

This is a clear allusion to Dan 7 because along with the mention of the “one like a son of man” figure is the description of the “One to whom belongs the time before time” whose head was “white like wool”.⁸⁰ The “one like a son of man” figure in Daniel is presented to the “Ancient of Days”, whose “clothing was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool”.⁸¹ This combination of these details—one who had the appearance of a man, and an “ancient” one whose head was “like wool”—are found nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible. In the Revelation of John, the New Testament apocalypse, the same reference to the Ancient One in Dan 7 is made in Rev 1:14: “His head and his hair were white as white wool, white as snow; his eyes were like a flame of fire...” The reference in Revelation is surely a reference to

⁷⁷ See also J. J. Collins, *Daniel*, 80-1.

⁷⁸ *1 En* 48:2; 62:5, 7, 9, 14; 63:11; 69:26, 27, 29; 70:1; 71:14, 17.

⁷⁹ Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 34.

⁸⁰ Dan 7:9.

⁸¹ Dan 7:9.

Dan 7 and not *I En* 46, because it also contains the additional descriptions about snow and fire, details found in Dan 7 but not found in the Enochic account.⁸² On the other hand, *I En* 46 cannot be dependent on the account in Revelation because the ‘one like a son of man’ figure in Rev 1:12-16 is indistinguishable from ‘the Ancient One’; the descriptions of ‘the Ancient One’ in Dan 7 are applied to the ‘one like a son of man’, who is Jesus. In *I En* 46:1-3, however, the ‘one like a son of man’ figure and ‘the Ancient One’ retain their separate identities, remaining consistent with the Danielic account. Enoch even asks, “[w]ho is this, and from whence is he who is going as the prototype of the Before-Time?”⁸³ It is clear that the account in Dan 7 is being interpreted and re-used by two distinct traditions in very different ways. It is important to establish the link between the portrayal of ‘that son of man’ in *I En* and the ‘one like a son of man’ in Daniel because the figure of ‘that son of man’ is such a prominent character in the *Similitudes*. Knowing that the Enochic visions are shaped by Daniel allows the reader to better understand the imagery with which the writer is trying to communicate with regard to ‘that son of man’.

The *Similitudes*’ portrayal of ‘that son of man’ includes details that while they may be obscure or altogether absent in the Danielic vision, they are featured in other works that allude to Daniel. For example, in the vision of the eagle in 4 Ezra discussed above, the ‘one like a son of man’ figure is explicitly identified as a Davidic messiah. Here, in the *Similitudes*, the ‘son of man’ figure also has messianic overtones; he is referred to as “his Messiah” in both *I En* 48:10 and 52:4. Again the title is used in *I En* 52:4: “And he said to me, saying, ‘All these things which you

⁸² These details do appear in a later account: *I En* 71:1-2.

⁸³ *I En* 46:2.

have seen happen by the authority of his Messiah so that he may give orders and be praised upon the earth.’”⁸⁴ “His Messiah” is clearly a messianic title.⁸⁵

Furthermore, as also seen above in the vision of the eagle in 4 Ezra and also in the Gospel of Matthew, the ‘son of man’ figure has judicial functions in the eschaton. ‘That son of man’ figure also possesses judicial functions in the *Similitudes*,

Thenceforth nothing that is corruptible shall be found; for that Son of Man has appeared and has seated himself upon the throne of his glory; and all evil shall disappear from before his face; he shall go and tell to that Son of Man, and he shall be strong before the Lord of the Spirits. (*1 En* 69:27)⁸⁶

The judicial role of the ‘son of man’ figure, including the destruction of sinners, is highlighted in this text, and it appears that the image of the throne is also associated with the authority to pronounce judgment. Nickelsburg contends that the dominant theme in Dan 7 is kingship and not judgment, and that the motif of judgment derives from “non-Danielic, albeit royally oriented sources”.⁸⁷ According to Nickelsburg, the element of judgment comes not from Daniel, but a conflation of various Jewish traditions.

However, it is crucial to note that although the ‘son of man’ figure does not participate specifically in act of judging in Dan 7, the imagery of judgment is dominant nonetheless. The setting of the vision is a heavenly court where “thrones are set in place” with ‘the Ancient One’ taking his throne to pronounce judgment against the beasts.⁸⁸ In Dan 7:10, the writer describes the myriad of attendants waiting on ‘the Ancient One’, and vividly detailing a trial scene, describing how “the

⁸⁴ Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 37.

⁸⁵ I.e. Ps 2:2; 18:50; cf. *Ps Sol* 13:76: “...for all shall be holy and their king the anointed of the Lord.”

⁸⁶ Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 49.

⁸⁷ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 287, 312.

⁸⁸ Dan 7:9.

court sat in judgment, and the books were opened”. The imagery of thrones, as well as the action of sitting, is evocative of a judgment motif, as is seen in other biblical texts. Consider these two examples, one taken from the Psalms and one from the Proverbs: “But the LORD sits enthroned forever, he has established his throne for judgment” (Ps 9:7) and “A king who sits on the throne of judgment winnows all evil with his eyes” (Prov 20:8). There is a clear relationship between the king who sits on his throne and the task of judging. An example with even greater relevance to the trial scene in Dan 7 would be Joel 3:12, a text prophesying the eschatological judgment of the nations: “Let the nations rouse themselves, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there I will sit to judge all the neighbouring nations.”

Semantically, this text is very similar to Dan 7 in that God will presumably sit on a throne to judge the nations at a decisive moment in time. Aside from the fact that the nations are symbolized by beasts in Dan 7, Joel 3 has similar content to Dan 7; both focus on the judgment and destruction of the nations and the restoration and ascension to power of Israel. Furthermore, both use similar language to describe a similar scene, that of God depicted as a king who is seated on the throne of judgment (Dan 7:9-10; Joel 3:12). The connection between the throne and judgment derives from the idea that the responsibility of a king is to exact justice and righteousness. 2 Chronicles 9:8 describes the king saying, “Blessed be the LORD your God, who has delighted in you and set you on his throne as king for the LORD your God. Because your God loved Israel and would establish them forever, he has made you king over them, that you may execute justice and righteousness”. The Psalmist repeatedly praises the righteousness of God’s throne, saying that “righteousness and justice are the foundation of your throne” and because “you have maintained my just

cause...you have sat on the throne giving righteous judgment.”⁸⁹ Likewise, in Proverbs, the throne is frequently associated with righteousness and justice:

It is an abomination to kings to do evil,
for the throne is established by righteousness. (Prov 16:12)

Loyalty and faithfulness preserve the king,
and his throne is upheld by righteousness. (Prov 20:28)

Take away the wicked from the presence of the king,
and his throne will be established in righteousness. (Prov 25:5)

If a king judges the poor with equity,
his throne will be established forever. (Prov 29:14)

Therefore, the vision of Dan 7 likely draws upon imagery that already has an established judicial context due to the prevailing assumptions in the Hebrew Bible that a king is also a judge and that a good king will also administer justice.

Consequently, since the ‘one like a son of man’ figure is established as a king (he is given dominion, glory, and kingship), all peoples should serve him.⁹⁰ Since the judgment theme of the entire vision is so dominant, it is not at all surprising that interpreters of this text attribute judicial functions to the messiah figure. This is, in fact, what can be observed in the various interpretations of Dan 7.

The interpretation of Dan 7 by the writer of the *Similitudes* is remarkable in that it attempts to interpret the nameless and symbolic ‘one like a son of man’ figure in Dan 7 to be an actual figure, and moreover, it identifies this figure with a known character with a name: Enoch.⁹¹ While the ‘one like a son of man’ figure in Daniel is ambiguous because he appears in a vision where beasts represent kings and kingdoms and he merely represents the ‘the holy ones of the Most High’, ‘that son of

⁸⁹ Pss 89:14; 9:4.

⁹⁰ Dan 7:14.

⁹¹ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 288. The seer of Revelation associated the ‘son of man’ figure with Jesus, c.f. Rev 1:12-18.

man' in the *Similitudes* refers to a specific eschatological figure. Nickelsburg considers the Enochic portrayal of the Son of Man to be a "creative development and mutual modification of" of Daniel's heavenly figure, Davidic royal oracles, and the Servant of Deutero-Isaianic.⁹² The 'that son of man' figure in 1 Enoch is evidence for the phenomenon that certain interpreters of Dan 7 believed the 'one like a son of man' figure to be messianic, and that the tradition surrounding this figure was readily available to the Jewish imagination.

2.2.7. 2 Baruch

2.2.7.1. Contents

2 Baruch is a Jewish apocalypse that was written around 100-120 C.E. and only survives in partially-preserved manuscripts in Syriac. There are some parallels with 4 Ezra, which suggest that perhaps *2 Baruch* was written after 4 Ezra.⁹³ *2 Baruch*, like 4 Ezra, is also a response to the destruction of Jerusalem,⁹⁴ which according to the author was the result of the failure of Israel to keep God's Law. The different sections in *2 Baruch* narrate the events that are to take place after the destruction of Jerusalem: the judgment of God in chapters 13-20, the messianic era in chapters 21-34, and the time of the end in chapters 47-52. The text of *2 Baruch* is known from a Syriac manuscript; the following analyses will employ the English translation from Charlesworth's *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*.

2.2.7.2. Functions

⁹² Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 287.

⁹³ Cf. 4 Ezra 7:118 & 2 Bar 48:42; 54:19.

⁹⁴ T. W. Willet would also call *2 Baruch* a narrative theodicy, *Eschatology*, 77.

George Nickelsburg suggests that *2 Baruch* “presumes the messianic identification of the central figure of Daniel 7 and his judicial functions”.⁹⁵ The potential references to Daniel can be found in these three texts in *2 Baruch* pertaining to the ‘Messiah’ figure: *2 Bar* 30:1, *2 Bar* 39-40, and *2 Bar* 72:2. In *2 Bar* 30:1, there is a reference to the resurrection using language somewhat similar to that of Dan 12:1-2: “And it will happen after these things when the time of the appearance of the Anointed One has been fulfilled and he returns with glory, that then all who sleep in hope of him will rise.”⁹⁶ The connection with Daniel is the use of ‘sleeping’ as a euphemism for death, as well as the concept of resurrection from the dead. This is not a very strong allusion, as much of Daniel’s language is omitted, and furthermore, the Danielic text does not mention that the resurrection of the dead in connection with the appearance of the messiah; instead Michael, the great prince, the protector of the people will arise, and “many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt” (Rev 12:1-2). Both texts speak to an eschatological period, but the details concerning that period differ. In *2 Baruch*, the time of the Messiah is fulfilled and he returns in glory, but in Dan 12 there is no mention of any messiah figure, only an angelic being.

In *2 Bar* 36:1-37:1, Baruch sees a vision of the forest and a vine, and he learns in the interpretation of the vision in 39:1-40:3 that the trees of the forest of wickedness represent various kingdoms and the vine represents the Messiah of God.⁹⁷ The trees are largely destroyed and only one cedar remains in the forest. The vine pronounces judgment upon the remaining cedar, resulting in the cedar beginning to burn while the vine starts to glow; “unfading flowers” grow in the plain where the

⁹⁵ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 291.

⁹⁶ Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 631.

⁹⁷ Referred to as “My Messiah” in the text. *2 Bar* 39:7.

forest used to be (2 Bar 37:1).⁹⁸ In similar fashion to the book of Daniel, there are four kingdoms represented and special attention is given to the last kingdom: “After that a fourth kingdom arises whose power is harsher and more evil than those which were before it, and it will reign a multitude of times like the trees on the plain, and it will rule the times and exalt itself more than the cedars of Lebanon.”⁹⁹ This is a parallel to the fourth beast of Daniel, who is described as “terrifying and dreadful and exceedingly strong” (Dan 7:7). The fourth beast “had great iron teeth and was devouring, breaking in pieces, and stamping what was left with its feet”.¹⁰⁰ The remaining cedar in Baruch’s vision is also similar to the eagle in the vision of 4 Ezra, which also represents the fourth kingdom and is similarly destroyed by the messiah-lion. In all three texts Dan 7, 4 Ezra 11, and 2 Bar 36, the fourth kingdom suffers a similar fate: it is consumed by fire. Just as the beast and the eagle are burned, so the cedar in 2 Baruch is burned after receiving its judgment from the vine. The vine in 2 Baruch is an explicit messianic symbol. The angel gives Baruch the following interpretation: “And it will happen when the time of its fulfilment is approaching in which it will fall, that at that time the dominion of my Anointed One which is like the fountain and the vine, will be revealed”.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, the leader of the last kingdom will be taken up to Mount Zion to be judged and summarily executed by the Messiah:

The last ruler who is left alive at that time will be bound, whereas the entire host will be destroyed. And they will carry him on Mount Zion, and my Anointed One will convict him of all his wicked deeds and will assemble and set before him all the works of his hosts. And after these things he will kill him and protect the rest of my people who will be found in the place that I have chosen. And his dominion will last forever until the world of

⁹⁸ Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 632.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 633. 2 Bar 39:5.

¹⁰⁰ Dan 7:7.

¹⁰¹ Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 633. 2 Bar 39:7.

corruption has ended and until the times which have been mentioned before have been fulfilled.¹⁰²

Here, as in the interpretation of 4 Ezra of Dan 7, the writer draws upon the framework of the four kingdoms with the messiah figure playing an active role in judgment.

The final text, *2 Bar* 72-74, also speaks of the messianic time as “the bright lightning which came after the last dark waters”.¹⁰³ In this time, “[a]fter the signs have come of which I have spoken to you before, when the nations are moved and the time of my Anointed One comes, he will call all nations, and some of them he will spare, and others he will kill”.¹⁰⁴ There is no explicit allusion to Daniel within this text; however, it does seem to be related conceptually to the vision of the forest and the vine of *2 Bar* 39-40, which does draw upon Daniel. The messiah figure will sit on the throne of his kingdom and judge the nations. *2 Baruch* 73-74 describes in detail the fantastic, utopian state of the world where the Messiah governs. It is a time when “joy shall be revealed”, “rest will appear”, “illness will vanish”, and “nobody will again die untimely”.¹⁰⁵ This hope is further expressed in *2 Bar* 74:2-3: “For that time is the end of that which is corruptible and the beginning of that which is incorruptible. Therefore, the things which were said before will happen in it. Therefore, it is far away from the evil things and near to those which do not die. Those are the last bright waters which have come after the last dark waters.”¹⁰⁶ In the eschatological kingdom of God, all things will be restored to the way they should be.

¹⁰² Ibid. *2 Bar* 40:1-3.

¹⁰³ *2 Bar* 72:1; 74:4.

¹⁰⁴ Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 645. *2 Bar* 72.2.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. *2 Bar* 73:1-3.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 646.

2.2.8. Texts from Qumran

In an excellent survey of the Daniel tradition at Qumran, Peter Flint remarks that “the relatively large number of copies (eight) of Daniel at Qumran is surprising in view of the small size of the book”;¹⁰⁷ Flint feels that this phenomenon reflects the high scriptural status of the book. The Qumran community’s interest in Daniel is attested by eight manuscripts of the book found in three caves,¹⁰⁸ an explicit citation,¹⁰⁹ and several fragments that also pertain to Daniel in varying degrees. They are as follows: The Prayer of Nabonidus, 4Q552-553 (the talking trees vision), 4Q246 (the So-called Son of God text), and 4Q243-245 (known as pseudo-Daniel).¹¹⁰ There are two other texts, 4Q489 (pap4Qapocalypse ar) and 4Q551 (4QDaniel Suzanna? ar), with possible links to Daniel. However, due to the very tenuous nature of these connections,¹¹¹ the present study will focus its attention to the analysis of the other fragments.¹¹²

The current consensus is that Pseudo-Daniel is not an interpretation of Daniel, but an independent tradition, perhaps produced by someone within the Qumran community.¹¹³ The variety of texts related to Daniel in Qumran—whether they are copies of the Biblical text (the Danielic manuscripts), earlier or parallel recensions of a Danielic legend (the Prayer of Nabonidus), an original composition

¹⁰⁷ P. W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 2, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 364-365.

¹⁰⁸ Of the eight biblical Daniel scrolls found (1Q71-72, 4Q112-116, and 6Q7pap), eleven chapters of Daniel is attested in a form similar to the MT (and not the LXX).

¹⁰⁹ In 4QFlor fig. 1 ii.3:24, discussed below.

¹¹⁰ Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243, 4Q242, 4Q245) is published by J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint in J. VanderKam (consulting ed.), *Qumran Cave 4. XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 95-164.

¹¹¹ 4Q489 is only related to Daniel through two words, ܕܢܗܝܬܐ (appearance) and ܕܢܗܝܬܐ (you saw).

¹¹² For a discussion of the relationship of Daniel to 4Q489 and 4Q551, see Flint, “Daniel Tradition”, 561-562.

¹¹³ F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (New York: Brill, 1992), 129-136.

in the style of Daniel (Pseudo-Daniel), or allusions and citations to Daniel (4QFlorilegium and the So-called Son of God text (4Q246))—serve to illustrate the importance of the book for the Qumran community and demonstrates how a particular Jewish sect might have understood the text. The following section will deal with five Qumran texts with potential allusions to Daniel. These texts are: the Prayer of Nabonidus, 4QpsDan, 4Q 246 (the So-called Son of God text), 4Q 174, and 4Q552-553. In examining the influence of Daniel on Qumran texts, J. J. Collins would also add to these the alleged references to Daniel’s מִשְׁכִּיל¹¹⁴ and the “seventy weeks of years”¹¹⁵ in the *Community Rule*, various concepts of eschatological war of Dan 11-12 in the *War Scroll*, and even the Danielic motif of mystery and interpretation;¹¹⁶ however, the present study will be restricted to examples of literary dependence that involve several points of literary contact. English translations of the Qumranic texts will be taken from Florentina García Martínez’s *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*.¹¹⁷

2.2.8.1. Contents and Function

2.2.8.1.1. Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242)

The Prayer of Nabonidus (4QPrNab/4Q242) is a prayer attributed to the Babylonian king, Nabonidus, as reconstructed from four Aramaic fragments found at Qumran. The text is fragmentary, although scholars believe it to be as old as the 2nd century B.C.E.¹¹⁸ The Prayer of Nabonidus parallels the biblical episode in Daniel 4, in which King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon is afflicted for seven years and his

¹¹⁴ Dan 11:33.

¹¹⁵ Dan 9. Collins also sees a reference to Dan 9:25 in 11QMelch 2:18.

¹¹⁶ Collins, *Daniel*, 73-75.

¹¹⁷ F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

¹¹⁸ J. J. Collins, “Prayer of Nabonidus” in *ABD* 4 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 977.

condition is explained to him by Daniel. The Prayer of Nabonidus may have served as a source for the author of Daniel, or it may simply preserve an older version of the story. The prayer, as translated García Martínez,¹¹⁹ reads as follows:

Frgs. 1-3. Words of the prayer which Nabonidus, king of the la[nd of Babylon, [a great] king, prayed [when he was afflicted] by a malignant inflammation, by a malignant inflammation, by decree of the G[od Most] High, in Teiman. [I, Nabonidus] was afflicted [by a malignant inflammation] for seven years, and was banished far [from men, until I prayed to the God Most High] and an exorcist forgave my sin. He was a Je[w] from [the exiles, who said to me:] Make a proclamation in writing, so that glory, exal[tation and honour] be given to the name of the G[od Most] High. And I wrote as follows: When] [I was afflicted by a malig[nang] inflammation, [and remained] in Teiman, [by decree of the God Most High, I] prayed for seven years [to all] the gods of silver and gold, [of bronze and iron,] of wood, of stone and of clay, because [I thought] that they were gods [...]

Frag. 4. [...]...I had a dream [...] has gone far off, the peace of [...] [...] my friends. I could not [...] [...] as you were like [...]

Although the text is somewhat fragmentary, there are numerous similarities to the account concerning Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4, who like Nabonidus, was also stricken by God with a debilitating condition until “seven times shall pass over” him.¹²⁰ There are also some corresponding details, like the king having a dream which a Jewish exile interprets for him. The king’s references to the “gods of silver and gold” have a parallel in Dan 5:23, where Daniel rebukes King Belshazzar saying, “You have praised the gods of silver and gold, of bronze, iron, wood, and stone, which do not see or hear or know; but the God in whose power is your very breath, and to whom belong all your ways, you have not honored”. However, there are also some noticeable differences, for example the nature of the king’s illness, and of course, the name of the king. Regarding the relationship between the Prayer of Nabonidus and Daniel 4, Collins explains that the “relationship with Daniel 4 is not

¹¹⁹ García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 289.

¹²⁰ Dan 4:29.

necessarily one of direct literary dependence; the two stories may be different elaborations of a common tradition”.¹²¹ While the possibility of literary dependence does exist, unless there is evidence that can substantiate Collins’ claim, an argument to explain many of the similarities between the two texts solely based on a common tradition remains an argument from silence. However, Florentino García Martínez has located exactly this kind of evidence in an examination of the Nabonidus stela (Nab. H. 2 A/B), 4QpsDan Ar, and Job, concluding that although 4QprNab predates Dan 4, the two accounts are actually independent of each other.¹²² They simply stem from a common tradition and therefore, inherently have similarities.¹²³

2.2.8.1.2. *4QpsDan Ar (4Q243-245)*

While it is not clear whether the Qumran community produced any apocalyptic writings of their own,¹²⁴ it is evident that the Qumran library did include copies of Daniel and Enoch, which are both apocalyptic texts. Apart from these, there have also been other fragmentary texts with an apocalyptic motif, such as 4QpsDan Ar. 4QpsDan Ar consists of 3 fragmentary texts that all mention the name of Daniel. Two of the fragments (4Q Ar^{a+b}) overlap, and when the three fragments are pieced together, they appear to be an account of Daniel’s narration before the king and the courtiers of the history of the world with an eschatological conclusion in the style of Dan 9.¹²⁵ However, this history is told in a straightforward manner and not shrouded

¹²¹ Collins, *Nabonidus*, 977.

¹²² See García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 129-136.

¹²³ Ibid., 36, posits the background to be found in oriental Jewry.

¹²⁴ H. Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 495-530.

¹²⁵ So argues J. T. Milik, “‘Priere de Nabonide’ et autres ecrits d’un cycle de Daniel”. *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956): 407-15.

in metaphors like the visions in Daniel.¹²⁶ García Martínez, reviewing the published Qumranic texts of Milik, concludes that they “should be counted as one of the products of the apocalyptic tradition in which the Qumran sect has its roots, which would account for its preservation among the works of the library of Qumran.”¹²⁷ In his view, the writer of these texts borrows the basic apocalyptic themes (the seventy years, the kingdoms, etc) from Daniel and reuses them for his own purposes. Collins, for example, suggests that perhaps the writer “borrowed a context and some themes from the Book of Daniel to lend authority to his view of the origins of the community”.¹²⁸ Such a hypothesis is certainly plausible based on what is known about the community from the *Community Rule*, but one must also remain open to other options because of how little text of Pseudo-Daniel there is and because of its fragmentary condition.

2.2.8.1.3. 4Q 246 (*the So-called Son of God text*)

4Q246 is another fragmentary text which may have some connection to Daniel even though it does not bear his name. The content of 4Q246 is the interpretation of the vision of a king akin to Daniel’s interpretations of the king’s dream in Dan 2 and 4:

Col. II. [1] He will be called son of God, and they will call him son of the Most High. Like the sparks [2] of a vision, so will their kingdom be; they will rule several years over [3] the earth and crush everything; a people will crush another people, and a city another city. [4]...Until the people of God arises and makes everyone rest from the sword. [5] His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom, and all his paths in truth and uprigh[tness]. [6] The earth (will be) in truth and all will make peace. The sword will cease in the earth, [7] and all the cities will pay him homage. He is a great God among the gods (?).[8] He will make war with him; he will place the peoples in his

¹²⁶ For this reason, Collins claims that Pseudo-Daniel is not to be seen as an apocalypse. Collins, *Daniel*, 77.

¹²⁷ García Martínez, *Qumran*, 149. See also A. Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer* (SBM 12; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971), 49.

¹²⁸ Collins, *Daniel*, 78.

hand and cast away everyone before him. His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom, and all the abysses... (4Q246 f1ii:1-5, 9)¹²⁹

The above text specifically mentions a mysterious “son of God” figure whose “kingdom shall be an eternal kingdom”, and who will be obeyed by “all the cities”. Line 5 of Col. ii, bears the phrase, “his kingdom will be an eternal kingdom”, which has a parallel in Dan 7:27 occurring during Daniel’s vision of the ‘one like a son of man’: “[T]heir kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey them.”¹³⁰ In line 8 of column ii., there is a parallel to the eternal dominion of God in Dan 4:31 and 7:14. The referent of the “Son of God” figure has generated considerable debate and many suggestions have been offered. Milik and Puech believe the text refers to a Seleucid king¹³¹ while David Flusser suggests that the figure is the Antichrist.¹³² García Martínez, going in yet another direction, maintains that the figure is an eschatological saviour who is strictly non-messianic.¹³³ However, the messianic option (that the figure is a Davidic messiah) is argued for by Fitzmyer, Cross, and Collins and appears to be the most congruous in light of the dependence on Dan 7 for Col. ii 5 and given the messianic interpretations of this text by several other apocalyptic texts.¹³⁴ Cross writes, “The most striking parallels exist between the apocalypse of the Ancient of Days and the ‘one like a son of man’ in

¹²⁹ García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 138.

¹³⁰ According to García Martínez, the influence of Daniel on column ii is obvious. See García Martínez, *Qumran*, 169.

¹³¹ J. T. Milik, “Les modèles araméens du livre d’Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 15 (1992): 383-384; J. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula: Scholars Press: 1979), 60; E. Puech, ‘Fragment d’une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le “Royaume de Dieu”’, *RB* 99 (1992): 98-131.

¹³² D. Flusser, “The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran,” *Immanuel* 10 (1980): 31-37.

¹³³ García Martínez, *Qumran*, 169-170.

¹³⁴ Collins, *Daniel*, 79; F. M. Cross, “The Structure of the Apocalypse of ‘Son of God’ (4Q246)” in S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman, W. W. Fields (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 151; J. Fitzmyer, “4Q246: ‘The ‘Son of God’ Document from Qumran,” *Bib* 74 (1993): 153-174, argues that the figure is an heir to the Davidic throne, not explicitly a “messiah”.

Daniel 7, and the apocalypse of the 'Son of God,' [4Q246], suggesting that Daniel 7 too must be read as messianic."¹³⁵ Collins agrees with this view, using the Hebrew background of Psalm 2 as the framework to understand the title of 'Son of God'.¹³⁶ From this assertion, Collins goes even further to claim that the 'Son of God' figure of 4Q246 is an interpretation of the Danielic 'one like a son of man'. Collins states:

There is no reason to doubt that the 'Son of God' is an individual figure who represents the people of God in some way. If this understanding of the fragment is correct, then the 'Son of God' figure may well represent the earliest interpretation, or reinterpretation, of the enigmatic 'one like a son of man' of Daniel 7.¹³⁷

Although Collins' argument is based on a conceptual, rather than lexical or syntactical parallel, it is certainly worthy of consideration especially in light of later apocalyptic texts that also interpret Daniel in this way (Similitudes of Enoch, 4 Ezra, etc). However, whether one agrees with Collins regarding 4Q246's dependency on Dan 7, the fact remains that there are already linguistic parallels to Dan 7 that are widely accepted and documented by academics. The issue, then, is not whether Daniel was used, but the extent to which the so-called "Son of God text" was shaped by Daniel. Flint rightly observes that the so-called "Son of God text" is not a Danielic text since the prophet is never actually named, but the themes and language are reminiscent of those found in Daniel. It also appears that the contents are being uttered in the presence of a gentile king, as in Daniel and the *pseudo-Daniel* scrolls.¹³⁸ In this way, 4Q246, like *4QpsDan Ar*, is a Qumranic writing that is clearly influenced by Daniel but also goes beyond the Danielic text, borrowing phrases and ideas from Daniel but applying it to a new setting with new elements.

¹³⁵ Cross, *Son of God*, 153-154.

¹³⁶ Collins, *Daniel*, 79. Here, Collins cites Luke 1:32, 35 as an example of a similar parallel usage. See also, P. A. H. de Boer, "The Son of God in the Old Testament," *OTS* 18 (1973): 188-201.

¹³⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 79.

¹³⁸ Flint, "Daniel Tradition at Qumran", 361.

2.2.8.1.4. 4Q 174 (4Q Florilegium)

The eight biblical Daniel scrolls at Qumran contain attestations to every chapter of MT Daniel apart from chapter twelve; however, coincidentally there is a reference to Daniel 12:10 in 4Q174, in a text that refers to “the book of Daniel the prophet” with an explicit citation formula:

[...] as is written in the book of Daniel, the prophet: The wicked [act wickedly...] and the just [...shall be whi]tened and refined and a people knowing God will remain strong [...] ... [...] after [...] which is for them [...]

הִיאָהּ ה' -- אֲשֶׁר כָּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר דָּנִיֵּאל הַנְּבִיא לְהַרְשִׁיעַ
רָשָׁעִים -- אֲ צַדִּיקִים -- וְיִתְלַבְּנוּ וְיִצְטַרְפוּ וְעַם יוֹדְעֵי אֱלֹהִים
יִחְזִיקוּ הֵם -- אַחֲרֵי ה' -- אֲשֶׁר אֱלִיָּהֶמָּה יוֹ --

(4Q174 fragment 1, 3 ii:3-4)¹³⁹

There are many points of similarity with Dan 12:10 so as to make the citation certain:

יִתְבַּרְרוּ וְיִתְלַבְּנוּ וְיִצְטַרְפוּ רַבִּים וְהַרְשִׁיעוּ רָשָׁעִים וְלֹא
יִבְיִנוּ כָּל רָשָׁעִים וְהַמְשַׁכְּלִים יִבְיִנוּ

The text of Dan 12:10 mentions that “many shall be purified, cleansed, and refined, but the wicked shall continue to act wickedly”. This is echoed in the Qumranic text. Further on in Dan 12:10 it states, “None of the wicked shall understand, but those who are wise shall understand”.¹⁴⁰ This, too, has a direct parallel in the Qumranic text. The similarities between the two texts are unmistakable and do not require further elaboration.

¹³⁹ García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 137.

¹⁴⁰ Dan 12:10.

It is worth noting, however, that 4Q174 is work of Qumranic “midrash”¹⁴¹ which is to be distinguished from later rabbinic *midrashim*, and is replete with quotations and interpretations of various Hebrew Bible texts. Three primary texts (2 Sam 7:10-14; Pss 1:1; 2:1; and Deut 33:8-11, 12, 19-21) are interpreted by supplementary texts (Exod 15:17; Amos 9:11; Isa 8:11; Ezek 37:23; Dan 12:10) that are connected to the primary texts. The references to Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel are preceded by a citation formula: “As it is written in the book of Isaiah/ Ezekiel/ Daniel, the prophet...”¹⁴²

The similarities between the 4Q174’s quotation and the actual Danielic text are striking, and taken together with the citation formula, this text can be seen as containing a definite reference to Daniel. Such a clear reference to Daniel demonstrates not only the inspirational character of the book, but also its authoritative status—especially when considered alongside the other great scriptural texts being cited. On a final note, even though the existing manuscript of 4Q174 is generally acknowledged to be from the Herodian period (50-70 C.E.), the composition of the text is usually dated to an earlier Qumranic period (perhaps period IIB, circa 100-31 B.C.E.).¹⁴³ The significance of this early date cannot be understated because it demonstrates that the Book of Daniel must have achieved its authoritative status very early for it to be quoted as scripture in such an ancient text.

¹⁴¹ מדרש, a term found in the text itself (4Q174 1:14), describes the quotation of a scripture followed by the interpretation of that same scripture, an exercise that resembles *pesharim*, which is a type of Jewish writing consisting of a series of scriptures interpreted under a common theme, rather than midrash, as it is later found in rabbinic Judaism. Indeed, the word פֶּשֶׁר (*peshar*) is also used three times in 4Q174 to introduce particular interpretations of scripture (4Q174 Frag. 1 ii. 14, 19; Frag. 9 10:4). See also L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 230.

¹⁴² 4Q 174, fragment 1, 2i:15-16, 3ii:3-4.

¹⁴³ For a fuller discussion on the dating of 4Q174, see G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran 4QFlorilegium and Its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 83, and M. A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 257.

2.2.8.1.5. 4Q552-553 (4QFour Kingdoms)

The final Qumranic text to be discussed is the recently published 4Q 552-553; these are fragmentary texts that contain an account of a vision of four talking trees that represent four kingdoms:

Dawn rose and the four trees [...] A tree rose up and they turned away from it. And he said [to me:...Of what] species is it? And I said: How will I see and understand this? [And I saw] a tree of fragrances. [...] And I asked: What is your name? And he answered me: Babel. [And I said to him:] You are the one who rules over Persia. And [I saw another tree] ... [He who was be]low us swore by [...] and said that he was different (?). And I asked him: What is your na[me? And he said to me...] And I said to him: You are the one who [rules over...and over] the powers of the sea, and over the market [...And I saw] a third tree, and I said to him: [What is your name And he said to me...] Your vision [...] (4Q552 fl ii:1-12)¹⁴⁴

[...] destroyed. And I said to him: He is the one who [...] from [...] ... [...] And I saw [...] [...] [...] they will rejoice [...] the vision [...] ... the word [...] which will escape (4Q552 fl iii:1-12)¹⁴⁵

[...] the lord [...] [...] God Most High not [...] [...] which there is above them, and ... [...] [...] the lord of all, he who establishes judges [...] (4Q552 f2: 9-12)¹⁴⁶

Babylon, “the one who over Persia”, is the only identity of the trees that is revealed as the other names are no longer extant.¹⁴⁷ The two oft-quoted similarities with Daniel are the symbol of a tree for a kingdom, which is found in Dan 4, and the Danielic motif of the four kingdoms, which can be found in Dan 2 and 7. It is important to note that in the vision of Dan 4 there is only one tree—not four, and it represents the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar.¹⁴⁸ Furthermore, since the tree is a common symbol for kings and kingdoms in the Hebrew Bible and the New

¹⁴⁴ García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 138-139.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 139.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Flint deduces that the second kingdom, the one that “extended to the Great Sea”, is Greece, and that the third kingdom Syria. The fourth is either Rome or the eschatological kingdom. P. W. Flint, “Daniel Tradition at Qumran”, 362-363.

¹⁴⁸ Dan 4:20-22.

Testament,¹⁴⁹ the writer need not have been exclusively dependent on Daniel.

Moreover, some commentators have claimed that the fourth kingdom represents the kingdom of God due to the majestic and idyllic language used to describe the fourth tree, which is exceedingly higher than the rest of the trees.¹⁵⁰ However, this interpretation is problematic if the four kingdom motif is derived from Daniel because the fourth kingdom always represents the last worldly kingdom before the establishment of God's kingdom. Collins has suggested that the fourth kingdom is not the kingdom of God but Rome.¹⁵¹ Collins has a strong argument because the actual text about the fourth kingdom is fragmentary and merely describes "[...a fourth tree whose] summit reached to the heavens, ruling [over...] (frg. 6) [...] a place of water [...] calves and lambs [...]" (4Q553 frg. 4).¹⁵² The text could just as well describe a worldly kingdom because the tree that represented Nebuchadnezzar was also described similarly:

Upon my bed this is what I saw;
 there was a tree at the center of the earth,
 and its height was great.
 The tree grew great and strong,
 its top reached to heaven,
 and it was visible to the ends of the whole earth.
 Its foliage was beautiful,
 its fruit abundant,
 and it provided food for all.
 The animals of the field found shade under it,
 the birds of the air nested in its branches,
 and from it all living beings were fed. (Dan 4:10-12)

¹⁴⁹ I.e. Assyria and Egypt as a cedar of Lebanon (Ezek 31), Judges 9:7-15, Hosea 14:5-7; A tree is used as a metaphor for Israel in Mark 11:13, 20-21 (cf. Matt 21:19-21, Luke 13:6-9), Romans 11:17-24.

¹⁵⁰ So E. Cook, in M. Wise, M. Abegg, Jr. and E. Cook (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A New Translation*, 440.

¹⁵¹ J. J. Collins, "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in P. W. Flint & J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, Vol. 2, (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 415-417.

¹⁵² From *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New English Translation*, ed. Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg, Jr. and Edward M. Cook (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, revised 2005).

What could be called majestic and idyllic language is also used here, but it represents the Babylonian king, who was about to be “cut down” and “have [his] branches chopped off” (Dan 4:14). Clearly, exalted and flowery language can also be used to describe kingdoms in general and is not specifically reserved for God alone. The significant detail concerning the fourth kingdom in Daniel as well as in his interpreters, is its supremacy over the other worldly kingdoms—meaning that the references to the fourth kingdom could very well apply to Rome.¹⁵³ If the fourth kingdom can be interpreted this way, the four kingdoms motif corresponds considerably well with Daniel—even if the kingdoms mentioned are not exactly the same. Another noteworthy detail is that 4Q552 f6:9 refers to God as אֱלֹהֵי יוֹן (God “Most High”), a title used frequently in Daniel to address God.¹⁵⁴

It has been demonstrated that 4Q552-553 uses the metaphor of a tree to describe kingdoms, employs a four kingdoms motif, and uses a title for God that is common in Daniel. On their own, these individual pieces of evidence may seem insignificant, but when seen together they make for a compelling argument that the vision of the four trees was influenced by the Book of Daniel.

2.2.9. Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*

2.2.9.1. *Contents and Functions*

The last Jewish text that will be examined is Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*, which was written around 95-100 C.E. Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* is written in Greek and describes the history of the Jewish people, starting with their national history as

¹⁵³ “And there shall be a fourth kingdom, strong as iron; just as iron crushes and smashes everything, it shall crush and shatter all these.” Dan 2:40; “After this I saw in the visions by night a fourth beast, terrifying and dreadful and exceedingly strong...It was different from all the beasts that preceded it, and it had ten horns.” Dan 7:7; cf. The eagle Vision in 4 Ezra.

¹⁵⁴ The Aramaic title אֱלֹהֵי יוֹן appears 11 times in MT Daniel, while ὁ ὑψίστος appears 14 times in both the LXX and Theodotion Greek versions.

narrated by the Hebrew Bible and ending with the Jewish war. Josephus includes much of Daniel's material from chapters 1-6 in his retelling of biblical history and even relates one of the visions (Dan 8). Daniel is referred to by name¹⁵⁵ forty-nine times throughout *Jewish Antiquities*, which illustrates how highly he was regarded by Josephus, who went so far as to describe Daniel as one of the greatest of the prophets (ἐνί τινι τῶν μεγίστων).¹⁵⁶ In *Ant.* 10:249, Josephus narrates the story detailing when Baltasar takes Daniel with him into Media, during which Josephus refers to him as "a prophet" (ὅς καὶ Δανιήλον τὸν προφήτην λαβὼν ἤγαγεν εἰς Μηδίαν). However, it is in *Ant.* 10:264-271 that Josephus' effusive praise of Daniel becomes prevalent. Daniel is described as illustrious (ἐπίσημος), bright (λαμπρὸς), and as having a reputation of being divinely favoured (ἐπὶ δόξῃ τοῦ θεοφιλῆς εἶναι).¹⁵⁷ Josephus writes that although Daniel is gone, his works, whether of architecture or literature, remain and are still of great value.¹⁵⁸ Daniel's prophetic inspiration was of particular interest to Josephus, who felt that Daniel was different from the other prophets because Daniel not only foretold misfortunes, but also good tidings and gave predictions of an auspicious nature.¹⁵⁹ It was for these kind of predictions that "he gained credit among the multitude for his truthfulness and at the same time won their esteem for his divine power."¹⁶⁰ For Josephus, Daniel was able to prophesy future events and "determine the season in which these things will happen" (ἀλλὰ καὶ καιρὸν ὥριζεν εἰς ὃν ταῦτα ἀποβήσεται) because he associated with God

¹⁵⁵ Josephus prefers the declinable form Δανιήλος, rather than the more common and indeclinable form Δανιήλ (in the LXX Δανιήλος does not occur but Δανιήλ occurs 127 times; in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha the form Δανιήλος only occurs once, whereas Δανιήλ has 12 occurrences).

¹⁵⁶ *Ant.* 10:266.

¹⁵⁷ *Ant.* 10:264.

¹⁵⁸ *Ant.* 10:266-267.

¹⁵⁹ *Ant.* 10:268.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.* English translation taken from *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities, Books IX-XI*, trans. R. Marcus (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 307.

(ὅτι Δανίηλος ὠμίλει τῷ θεῷ).¹⁶¹ P. Bilde writes, “Josephus seems to share the ‘apocalyptic’ interpretation of Daniel as the Jewish prophet of highest relevance...because he was the unique revealer of God’s salvatory plans for the Jewish people.”¹⁶²

It is crucial to understand Josephus’ high regard of Daniel, because Josephus also attempts to appropriate Daniel’s prophecy for his own time. He believed that the prophecies of Daniel were prophecies about Rome and the future.¹⁶³ For Josephus, “the power like iron” in the prophecy of Dan 2 most likely refers to Rome and the connotation is that the “stone without hands” refers to God’s kingdom, which will ultimately destroy Rome.¹⁶⁴ However, Josephus is reluctant to express this openly, instead he states:

And Daniel also revealed to the kind the meaning of the stone, but I have not thought it proper to relate this, since I am expected to write of what is past and done and not of what is to be; if, however, there is anyone who has so keen a desire for exact information that he will not stop short of inquiring more closely but wishes to learn about the hidden things that are to come, let him take the trouble to read the Book of Daniel, which he will find among the sacred writings.¹⁶⁵

Josephus intentionally conceals his beliefs—possibly because of the knowledge that his audience may include Romans.¹⁶⁶ Perhaps it is for this reason as well that Josephus omits any mention of Dan 7. An allusion to Dan 7 would necessitate a discussion of the reign of God’s kingdom and the judgment of the nations which is

¹⁶¹ *Ant.* 10:267. My own translation.

¹⁶² P. Bilde, “Josephus and Jewish Apocalypticism” in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives*, ed. S. Mason (JSPSup 32; Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 11.

¹⁶³ L. Grabbe, “Eschatology in Philo and Josephus,” in A. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, Part 4. *Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection & the World-to-Come in the Judaism of Antiquity* (Handbuch der Orientalistik: Erste Abteilung, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 17; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 163-185.

¹⁶⁴ *Ant.* 10:195-210. Translation taken from *Josephus*, 275.

¹⁶⁵ *Ant.* 10:210, *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁶ See F. F. Bruce, “Josephus and Daniel” in *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4 (1965): 160; and also Crossley, *The Date of Mark’s Gospel*, 38.

observable in other texts that allude to Dan 7. However, this assertion is only speculative. Josephus only included one vision, which is from Dan 8, into his work and his reason for omitting Dan 7 could be as simple as the fact that he preferred to work with Daniel's narrative material, not his visions, but this is only speculative as well.

Concerning the discussion of βδέλυγμα ἑρμώσεως/ τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἑρμώσεως in 1 Macc, it is noteworthy that Josephus' interpretation of the vision in Dan 8 had two separate references, Antiochus IV and Rome:

And these misfortunes our nation did in fact come to experience under Antiochus Epiphanes, just as Daniel many years before saw and wrote that they would happen. In the same manner Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans and that Jerusalem would be taken by them and the temple laid waste. All these things, as God revealed them to him, he left behind in his writings, so that those who read them and observe how they have come to pass must wonder at Daniel's having been so honoured by God...¹⁶⁷

Josephus' comment is highly significant given his admiration for both the figure and the prophecies of Daniel. Even though he held Daniel in high regard, he also has the liberty to re-interpret his prophecies, precisely because they are left behind so that those who read them will believe that God governs the affairs of human life, and that "the universe is directed by a blessed and immortal Being".¹⁶⁸ As with other interpreters of Daniel's visions in early Judaism, Josephus continues to re-read Daniel and to apply the visions to meet new challenges and situations.

¹⁶⁷ *Ant.* 10:276. Translation taken from *Josephus*, 311.

¹⁶⁸ *Ant.* 10:278. Translation taken from *Josephus*, 313.

2.3. Observations

2.3.1. The Widespread Use of Daniel in Early Jewish Literature

The survey of Early Jewish literature above has shown that the Book of Daniel was a text that was widely available to and frequently utilized by first-century Jews from a broad spectrum of religious convictions and ideological commitments. Some were Hellenized Jews whose writings reflected Greco-Roman elements and whose writing style followed a Greek hexameter style. For them, the visions of Daniel were one of many sources of inspiration along with other myths and legends. Others were militant, revolutionary Jews, for whom the legends of Daniel and his companions' courage in the face of religious persecution functioned as a source of inspiration to remain true to their cause in the face of tyranny. The stories about Daniel's deliverance from harm serve as evidence of God's salvation in situations where God's deliverance is actively sought. Apocalyptic texts in the wake of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. also drew upon Daniel—borrowing its symbolic language and the thematic structure of the four kingdoms to make sense of the world in the face of tragedy and to communicate God's reign and judgment against the enemy in a new setting. While the apocalyptic identity of the Qumran community is still disputed, there can be little debate that the Qumran library contained a wealth of manuscripts related to the Book of Daniel. There must have been considerable interest in Daniel among the sectarians, as evinced by the original Qumranic texts that appear to be written in the style of the Danielic visions. Daniel and his prophecies were also highly esteemed by the Jewish historian Josephus, who wrote especially for a Roman audience.

2.3.2. The Authoritative Status of Daniel in Early Jewish Literature

Many writers in early Jewish literature took for granted the authoritative status of Daniel. Moreover, the functions of many allusions and references are dependent on the authoritative status of Daniel. For example, in 4 Macc 18:12-13, the father of the seven brothers is said to have taught them from the “law and the prophets” (τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας), including Daniel in the Jewish scriptures. But perhaps the most convincing example of the authoritative status of Daniel is seen in the manuscripts at Qumran. Not only have eight different manuscripts of the biblical scroll of Daniel been found at Qumran, there are attestations to all twelve chapters of the book of Daniel. Furthermore, there is a direct citation in 4Q174 that is complete with a citation formula identifying Daniel as the writer as well as a scriptural reference that resembles the source text (Dan 12:10). The significance of this Danielic citation is even greater when one considers that it is found in a *peshirim*-like document, which is essentially a series of interpretations of a set of scriptural texts the community holds to be authoritative. The citation and interpretation of Daniel appears alongside references to other obviously authoritative biblical texts, including Exodus, Deuteronomy, 2 Samuel, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Amos, and the Psalms. The presence of the Danielic citation is surely compelling evidence for the authoritative status of Daniel at that time.

The authoritative status of Daniel was not restricted to the text of Daniel; it also applied to the figure of Daniel. For Josephus, the character of Daniel is firmly incorporated into the legacy of Israel’s tradition as a man beloved by God and a man who converses with God. Josephus’ use of Daniel is especially poignant in this regard because he deals with materials from both the Danielic legend narratives as

well as the visions. Josephus paraphrases much of the material of Dan 1-6 and gives every indication that Daniel was an actual figure. In fact, Josephus compares Daniel with the other prophets and considers him to be one of the greatest of the prophets. His admiration and reception of Daniel's visions stems from his belief that Daniel is a great prophet with admirable qualities, which is how some other interpreters also refer to Daniel. Interpreters of Daniel do not merely cite the text of Daniel, instead they look to the figure of Daniel as an exemplary hero of faith who is a part of Israel's great tradition of men who are faithful to God despite adversity and persecution. Such is the function of the Danielic allusion in 4 Macc 18:12-13; Daniel is but one person on a long list of notable figures in Israel's tradition from whom the seven brothers should learn.

3. Continuity, Discontinuity, and Ingenuity

Another fascinating phenomenon is that although most interpreters of Daniel treat the text as scripture, they also exercise considerable freedom in embellishing, adapting, and re-writing it. All these references and interpretations demonstrate the fact that writers of Jewish literature in this period often appropriate Danielic material to suit their current situation and need—even if that means going beyond the confines of Daniel's literary and historical context. For them, the original intentions of the text of Daniel was secondary to the writer's own agendas and convictions. For example, open-ended prophecies are taken to refer to the current situation of a specific group of people (i.e. Dan 7 in 4Q246). Various imagery and symbols—the referents of which were ambiguous in the source text—are later interpreted by writers to refer to actual figures and events that are known by and have significance in a certain community—like the 'abomination of desolations' in the New Testament

(Mark 13:14; Matt 24:15). Additionally, writers would even interpret open-ended texts to refer specifically to beliefs held by those in their own community. For example, in the end of the *Similitudes of Enoch*, Enoch discovers *he* is the son of man figure. Furthermore, some writers display a tendency to conflate Danielic material with elements from other texts and traditions, which results in a blend of ideas held together by the writer's own creativity, interpretative method, and authorial intentions. A prime example of this is the eagle vision of 4 Ezra and Pseudo-Daniel.

The observations above suggest that various texts—Daniel in particular—were chosen and utilized based on how closely the content of those texts aligned with the ideology of the writer. Although the logic of this might be self-evident, it is important to observe the writer's ideology comes first; the selected texts are then used to corroborate and give weight to what the writer is communicating. While a writer may employ a certain text because he presupposes his audience's familiarity with it, this is not necessarily the case. The intended audience may or may not be familiar with the background of the quoted text. Writers need not always appeal to another text for authority.¹⁶⁹ For example, a quoted text might be used to better illustrate or elaborate a point the writer is making regardless of whether the quoted text is authoritative for his audience. Similarly, the quoted text may articulate the same idea as the writer, but in a superior manner which may prompt the writer to appropriate the material. However, we can say with certainty that the writer was familiar with the quoted text and included it into his writing according to his own motivation. Given the significant role that religious texts play in communities that

¹⁶⁹ In cases where a writer is appealing to the authority of a text, one can better assume the audience is familiar to the quoted text. These cases mostly consist of direct quotations and often are accompanied by an identifying ascription.

hold them to be authoritative, it is likely the author was at least partially motivated to rewrite and incorporate the text through direct references, quotes, and allusions as a way to gain authority and perhaps even, pay homage to a revered passage. Similar to early Christian exegetical practices observed in the New Testament writings, the Old Testament texts that are referenced are “reused and revitalized” to express the religious realities of a markedly different nature.¹⁷⁰

¹⁷⁰ J. Barr, *Escaping From Fundamentalism* (London: SCM, 1984), 105.

CHAPTER 3—DANIELIC REFERENCES IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

3.1. Introduction

Danielic references are prevalent in many kinds of early Jewish literature, including historical narratives, apocalypses, the historical writings of Josephus, and the texts found at Qumran which also include a range of styles: narrative material, visionary and apocalyptic material, *peshet*, etc. The book of Daniel achieved authoritative status very early on as evidenced by the occurrence of references to Danielic writings adjacent to references to other authoritative texts in 4QFlorilegium and also 1 & 3 Maccabees.

Early Jewish writers who allude to Daniel tend to use the Danielic material in two important ways. They tend to allude to the figure of Daniel as portrayed by the legends in Dan 1-6. Daniel is seen as an exemplary man of God whose faith and integrity are clearly demonstrated in the tale of Daniel in the lions' den.¹ Daniel is an example of an innocent man who faces adversity for adhering to his ancestral customs, but who is ultimately delivered and vindicated by God before his oppressors. References to and re-interpretations of Daniel's visionary content are

¹ The story of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego in the fiery furnace is also used in this way. The Daniel figure is primary, as sometimes the Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego are simply referred to as Daniel's companions.

found predominantly in Dan 7-12.¹ Because the visions are associated with the figure of Daniel, they share in the authority attributed to him. The visions themselves have an open-ended prophetic quality to them, lending them the capacity to be adapted and rewritten by later interpreters according to their own purposes. The process of adaptation can be as simple as assigning known referents to open-ended symbols from Daniel's visions or as complex as writing new versions of the Danielic tradition. These authors compose new texts based on the language, expressions, and framework of the Danielic visions. The visionary material of Daniel which contains powerful symbols and imagery pertaining to the succession of worldly kingdoms is utilized by various authors to create reassuring theological perspectives for Jews of different periods.

The message of Daniel is one of reassurance because it illustrates that not even the succession of worldly political powers are beyond the sovereignty of God and even the last and most fearsome power will surely be followed by the rule of God himself, which he will then give over to his own people. It is a reminder that regardless of how relentless the foreign oppression may be, it will assuredly come to an end and God will vindicate Israel. Such is the apocalyptic outlook presented by the visions of Daniel, and interpreters from different time periods all understood the visions to be relevant to their own situations. Each interpreter saw the oppression of their day to be that which was foretold by Daniel, and accordingly, they eagerly awaited God's eschatological action as described in Daniel.

The Danielic symbols that represent worldly kings and kingdoms were variously interpreted to conform to the kings and kingdoms in the contemporary

¹ Visionary material is also found in Daniel's interpretations of the kings' dreams in Dan 2 and 4.

historical context of each particular interpreter. The decisive action of God which in Daniel is represented by the judgment of the nations and the re-installation of the kingdom of Israel is subjected to speculation and interpretation by later interpreters. However, it should also be noted that the Book of Daniel was not alone in espousing such an apocalyptic vision and that there were also other texts that contributed an eschatological perspective of history. It may be more accurate to say that although authors made use of the text of Daniel, they were drawing on a larger tradition of apocalyptic writing concerning Jewish hopes and expectations from which Daniel stems. This accounts for the variance often observed in the interpretations of Daniel in early Jewish literature and for the tendency of authors to conflate details from Daniel with those from other texts. Daniel is an important and inspirational text in early Jewish literature because the views it articulates are in line with early Jewish eschatology and are relevant to the political unrest experienced by many Jews in that time period.

It is therefore likely that the Markan evangelist was also familiar with Daniel and the greater apocalyptic tradition to which it belongs. In fact, given Josephus' lofty praise of Daniel and his visions, it would be surprising if the Markan evangelist was unaware of the book of Daniel. Mark's gospel contains an extended apocalyptic discourse in Mark 13 which is likely to have been influenced by Daniel's text and ideas. Through the analysis and evaluation of the ten *loci* in Mark that have been identified to contain Danielic references by the editors of the latest editions² of the Greek New Testament, we will better understand the contours of Danielic usage in Mark, and we can determine how these references function in the Markan narrative.

² NA27: Nestle-Aland (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993); UBS4: Aland et al. (eds), *The Greek New Testament*, 4th ed. (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 2001).

To avoid controversial debates about what constitutes a valid reference or allusion, this dissertation utilizes only texts identified by the editors to the NA27 and the UBS4. While the decisions of these committees are sometimes disputed, there may be disagreement on the allusions, and there may be allusions that these committees have disregarded, the references identified by the NA27 and UBS4 texts provide a useful starting point in the examination of the texts as a whole. This dissertation will use the texts the NA27 and UBS4 identified as a neutral starting point because even if some of the allusions are rejected,³ the larger picture remains and that is what this dissertation hopes to reveal. The text and ideas of Daniel are significant to Mark's narrative and theology in a way that goes beyond individual quotations and allusions as is evidenced when the allusions are considered as a whole. To demonstrate this we must first establish the extent to which and the ways in which Mark explicitly makes use of Daniel. The verses where it is generally agreed upon by scholars that Danielic references exist are the only logical starting point.

In both the NA27 and UBS4 versions of the New Testament, the editors responsible for the editions provide an index of cross-references in the margins or at the bottom of each page. In the introduction to the UBS4, the cross-references are categorized as quotations from biblical and non-biblical books, as definite allusions—where it is assumed that the writer had in mind a specific passage of Scripture, or as “literary and other parallels”.⁴ As a result, the texts that are referenced are acknowledged to have some relation to the verse in question; however, there is no further differentiation as to which category the literary relationship should be designated within. For example, in the cross-referenced entry

³ It will seen that two of the allusions identified by the NA27 are rejected by the present study.

⁴ The Greek New Testament (UBS4), 46*.

for Mark 13:26⁵ “τὸν υἱὸν ... δόξης Dn 7.13-14; Mk 8:38; Re 1.7” is listed without any indication as to whether the editors are suggesting that the Danielic reference is a direct quotation, a definite allusion, or a literary parallel. In the NA27 text, the editors indicate that direct quotations are represented by italics, whereas allusions are in normal type, however, as with the UBS4, they offer no explanation as to the rationale behind the selection of texts that have been cross-referenced. The major contribution of the present study is the careful analysis of each reference to Daniel and an examination of the evidence and grounds for literary dependence.

The NA27 text identifies three direct quotations (Mark 13:14; 13:26; 14:62), and seven other texts where a Danielic reference is considered to be present. The UBS4 text which makes no distinction between direct quotations and allusions only identifies five Danielic references. The five references selected in the UBS4 text are also among those references selected in the NA27 text. In this chapter, each cross-reference to Daniel in the gospel of Mark from both the NA27 and UBS4 will be analyzed in order to determine the relationship of the reference to Daniel and the function of the Danielic reference in that text. The editors of the UBS4 categorize the references as direct quotations, definite allusions, and literary parallels. However, none of the references to Daniel in Mark (including texts the NA27 considers to be direct quotations) include a citation-formula that explicitly identifies Daniel as its source. For this reason, all of the Danielic references in Mark fall into the category of allusions.

⁵ The Greek New Testament (UBS4), 175.

3.1.1. Method

The designation of a text as an allusion or reference suggests an element of intentionality by the author to lead his audience to read his text through the lens of another text. For the purposes of the present study, the consideration of a Markan text as a reference to Daniel will take into account three factors. Firstly, is the content of the suggested reference unique to Daniel? Are there other sources from which the referenced ideas or words could have arisen? And if so, what evidence supports that Daniel is the most likely source? Secondly, there must be at least two identifiable similarities between Mark and Daniel that can be used to ascertain literary dependence. These similarities can be lexical, grammatical, and even conceptual. While literary dependence can not be determined by the sharing of a singular word, if an entire phrase from Daniel is used or if the grammatical structures are the same, it increases the likelihood of literary dependence. Thirdly, does Mark exhibit contextual awareness of the text being referenced? Mark's use of Daniel does not have to be in line with the original meaning of the Danielic text. In fact, Mark often employs Danielic texts and ideas in completely novel ways beyond what is intended in Daniel. However, if it can be shown that Mark is familiar with other elements from Daniel, it significantly increases the likelihood that Mark is making use of that particular Daniel text.

The focus of the current study is to examine the textual data used to determine literary dependence so as to assess Mark's overall use of Daniel. The relevant texts are analyzed for lexical, grammatical, and conceptual similarities so that the extent and shape of literary dependence can be clearly observed. By using such an approach, even if there is disagreement about whether a certain text is a

Danielic allusion, there can be discussions about the evidence and rationale behind the decision. This transparency provides a valuable starting point for a topic that is becoming increasingly subjective because what one person is convinced is a definite allusion may seem to another to be an echo or literary parallel. While the present study does not attempt to classify references into categories, the strength of each literary relationship will be evaluated via examination of the textual data.

The analysis of each Markan Danielic reference will be divided into three sections: the Markan context of the reference, the Danielic reference in Mark, and the literary function of the Danielic reference in the Markan narrative. The first section is the discussion of the Markan context of the passage containing the reference where the literary context of the reference in Mark is examined in regard to several questions. In which part of Mark's narrative does the reference appear? How does the reference fit into the narrative sequence or themes of the Markan text? The second section analyzes the Danielic reference further by comparing the Markan text with both the Greek versions of Daniel (LXX and Θ) and the MT in order to observe any lexical, grammatical, and conceptual similarities. In this section there will also be a discussion of all potential sources for the referenced material. Section two will conclude with an evaluation of the strength of the Danielic allusion. The third section of the analysis consists of a discussion concerning the literary function of the Danielic reference in Mark which raises several questions. Why does Mark make this reference to Daniel? How does a reference to Daniel at this point contribute to what Mark is trying to convey? The questions raised in these three sections will be considered in regard to each of the ten verses of Mark that have been identified by the NA27 and UBS4 texts. The purpose of this chapter is to examine in detail the

evidence for the established connections to Daniel. In light of the Danielic references reviewed in this section, two other Markan texts which might also contain references to Daniel are also suggested at the end of the chapter.

3.1.2. Frequency and Distribution

Before we proceed to the close analysis of each verse, it will be helpful to observe the pattern of distribution of these references in the Gospel of Mark. According to the editors of the NA27 and UBS4, there are ten verses that contain references to Daniel which appear in five out of fifteen chapters of Mark. They are found in chapters one, four, nine, thirteen, and fourteen. It can be seen from this distribution that references to Daniel can be found in multiple pericopes and across different settings in Mark's narrative, spreading out over a narrative range that includes a description of the beginning of Jesus' ministry (Mark 1), the parable of the sower (Mark 4), the transfiguration of Jesus (Mark 9), an eschatological discourse (Mark 13), and in Jesus' reply before the high priest (Mark 14). Apart from the reference made in the account of the transfiguration in Mark 9, all of the references to Daniel occur in the direct speech of Jesus. While the majority of the occurrences appear only once per chapter, chapter four contains two references and chapter thirteen contains the highest concentration of Danielic references with five occurrences. Apart from Mark 13:26 and 14:62 which both allude to the same Danielic reference (Dan 7:13), each Markan reference alludes to different parts of the Danielic text. The suggested references from Daniel are from chapters two, four, seven, and twelve. On the face of it, this distribution is also noteworthy because the references are both taken from the Danielic legends (Dan 1-6) as well as the Danielic visions (Dan 7-12). This dissertation will examine each Markan text individually and assess its

relationship to the suggested reference to Daniel as we move from chapter to chapter.

The figure below displays the number of Danielic references in each chapter of Mark, along with the Danielic sources.

Figure 5: The Frequency and Distribution of Danielic References in Mark.

Chapter in Mark	# of Danielic References	Danielic Sources
1	1 (Mk 1:15)	Dan 7:22
2	---	
3	---	
4	2 (Mk 4:11; Mk 4:32)	Dan 2:27-28, 47; 4:9,12,18, 21
5	---	
6	---	
7	---	
8	---	
9	1 (Mk 9:3)	Dan 7:9
10	---	
11	---	
12	---	
13	5 (13:7; 13:13; 13:14; 13:19; 13:26)	Dan 2:28-29, 45; 12:12; 12:11; 11:31; 9:27; 12:1; 7:13s
14	1 (14:62)	Dan 7:13
15	---	

3.2. Danielic References in the Gospel of Mark

3.2.1. References in Chapter 1

3.2.1.1 Mark 1:15 / Dan 7:22

πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ·

3.2.1.1.1 THE MARKAN CONTEXT

There is only one suggested reference to Daniel in the first chapter of Mark, and it is found in Mark 1:15, which records the first account of direct speech by Jesus in the book. The editors of the NA27 text consider this to be an allusion to Daniel, while the editors of the UBS4 text do not acknowledge the Danielic reference. The setting

of this reference is the beginning of Jesus' preaching ministry which is preceded by but does not appear to overlap with the ministry of John the Baptist; it is only *after* John's arrest (Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην) that Jesus begins preaching in Galilee (Mark 1:1-4-14).⁶ Jesus is baptized by John in the Jordan River, is tempted in the desert for forty days, and emerges from the desert to preach the gospel of God in Galilee. Mark 1:15 contains the content of that proclamation which is signalled by the direct speech formula of the participle λέγων followed by ὅτι, indicating direct discourse.

The proclamation has two components: a pair of verbs in the indicative mood (πεπλήρωται and ἤγγικεν) followed by a pair of verbs in the imperative mood (μετανοεῖτε, πιστεύετε). The symmetry between the indicative verbs and the imperative verbs in the proclamation implies a connection between the two sets of verbs. Jesus first announces that the time has come, followed by the announcement of the imminence of the kingdom of God.

Most interpreters translate πληρόω as 'fulfilled', however, it is highly unusual for a particular time to be fulfilled in both the New Testament and the LXX.⁷ The combination of the passive verb 'to fulfil' (πληρόω) with the subject, time (ὁ καιρός), means that a particular time has been completed.⁸ As J. Marcus has similarly suggested, πληρόω when used temporally evokes the image of a span of

⁶ See also R. A. Culpepper, *Mark* (Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2007), 52.

⁷ For the fulfilment interpretation, see translations of Mark 1:15 in the NRSV, NIV, NASB; see also R. A. Guelich, "The Beginning of the Gospel", in *Biblical Research* 27 (1982), 12. A. Y. Collins argues that what are being fulfilled are "the prophecies of scripture and the hopes of the people" and "the fulfilment of history". See A. Y. Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 154-155; I. Howard Marshall considers Mark 1:15 to be in the "language of fulfillment", I. H. Marshall, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2004), 59-60; Culpepper allows both interpretations, R. A. Culpepper, *Mark*, 52.

⁸ See a similar use of these verbs in Luke 21:24; John 7:8; Tobit 14:5. Clearly, Mark 1:15 belongs in the second definition of πληρόω given in BDAG, "to complete a period of time".

time that has become full.⁹ Understood in this light, the meaning of πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς should be: ‘the time has elapsed’. A similar use of καιρός and πεπλήρωται can be found in John 7:8 when Jesus tells his brothers he is not going to the festival because his time has not yet arrived (ὁ ἐμὸς καιρὸς οὐπω πεπλήρωται). In the context of the Gospel of John, there is previous mention of a time that Jesus must fulfil by going to the festival, rendering the fulfilment interpretation untenable. Furthermore, in the LXX and the New Testament, πληρόω is frequently used with a temporal noun (usually ἡμέρα) to denote the passing of time with no particular emphasis on fulfilment. In Acts 9:23, the Jews conspired to kill Saul ‘after many days had gone by’ (Ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦντο ἡμέραι ἱκαναί). ἐπληροῦντο merely explains that a sufficient number of days had elapsed. Similarly in the LXX, with regard to a temporal subject, πληρόω seems only to describe a span of time. For example, in Gen 25:24 Rebekah had twins in her womb ‘when her time to give birth was at hand’ (ἐπληρώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν). And in Gen 29:21, when Jacob was finished with his seven years of labour he asked for Rachel’s hand in marriage, saying to his uncle Laban, ‘Give me my wife that I may go in to her, for my time is completed’ (πεπλήρωνται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι μου). There are also many other examples in the LXX of πληρόω being used without any suggestion of fulfilment.¹⁰ In the Gospel of Mark, πληρόω is only used one other time in Mark 14:49 in connection with the arrest of Jesus being the fulfilment of the scripture (ἀλλ’ ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί). πληρόω does denote fulfilment here, but it is due to the fact that the subject of the scriptures (αἱ γραφαί) is something that can be

⁹ J. Marcus, “The time has been fulfilled!” (Mark 1.15), in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards (JSNTSup 24; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 50.

¹⁰ See Gen 50:3; Lev 8:33; 12:4; 25:29; Num 6:5, 13; 2 Sam 7:12; 1 Chr 17:11; Tobit 8:20; Lam 4:18.

fulfilled. In all other cases where πληρόω is used temporally, the intended meaning is completion rather than fulfilment.

Apart from Mark 1:15, καιρός appears four times in Mark's gospel, and none of these occurrences seem to correspond with the meaning of καιρός in Mark 1:15. καιρός in Mark 10:30 refers to Jesus' disciples receiving a hundred-fold now, *in this time* (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ), in contrast with the age to come (ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ). καιρός in Mark 11:13 refers to a fig tree's season for bearing fruit (ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων). καιρός in Mark 12:2 is found in Jesus' parable of the vineyard and refers to the season of harvest when the landowner wished to collect from the fruits of the vineyard (καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς τῷ καιρῷ δοῦλον ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος). Finally, in Mark 13:33 καιρός refers to the eschatological day of judgment that has just been described by Jesus in Mark 13:24-31. Jesus warns, "Beware, keep alert; for you do not know when the time will come" (Mark 13:33). In this context, the 'time' (καιρός) specifically refers to a decisive time in the eschatological future. The verb used with καιρός in Mark 13:13 is not πληρόω, but simply the third-person singular indicative verb 'to be' (εἰμί). It is clear that the καιρός mentioned in Mark 13:33 is different from the καιρός in Mark 1:15; in Mark 1:15 the καιρός is completed (or has arrived) but the καιρός of Mark 13:33 is still in the future. It can be observed in the above texts that καιρός in Mark is an ambiguous term used to describe different sorts of time in a myriad of contexts. It can also be seen that the use of καιρός in Mark 1:15 is unique to Mark and that other occurrences of the word are used differently and are ultimately irrelevant when deciphering the meaning of καιρός in Mark 1:15.

A. Y. Collins suggests that Jesus' proclamation in Mark 1:15—particularly the manner in which Mark uses *καὶρός*, refers to the fulfilment of history via the kingship of God.¹¹ She writes, “‘The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God has drawn near,’ implies that the prophecies of scripture and the hopes of the people are in the process of being fulfilled”.¹² A. Y. Collins cites examples from the Dead Sea Scrolls and particularly the sectaries' use of Isaiah to demonstrate that there was a Jewish notion of periods of time leading up to the end of history, otherwise referred to as “the day of salvation”. She suggests that *καὶρός* in Mark 1:15 could refer to similar epochs of time that precede the commencement of God's rule. Collins also notices the similarity between the motifs of the eschatological herald in texts such as 11QMelch 2:16 in which a herald announces to the community that Melchizedek is king and the role of the prophetic figure of John the Baptist in Mark. Although the parallels Collins draws are apt and her observations astute, the underlying and crucial question of the function of *πληρόω* is not given sufficient attention. Collins moves quickly and without explanation from the phrase “the time is fulfilled” to the interpretation of “the prophecies of scripture and the hopes of the people are in the process of being fulfilled”.¹³ There is obviously some conceptual overlap between a “decisive time”, scriptural prophecy, and theological hope; however, Collins gives the impression that the three can be used interchangeably. If this is the case, it would be helpful for Collins to outline more explicitly the connection between the three ideas, because that underlying assertion is unsubstantiated. Furthermore, Collins draws attention to and makes comparisons with the “day of salvation” in the Dead

¹¹ A. Y. Collins, *Mark*, 155.

¹² A. Y. Collins, *Mark*, 154.

¹³ *Ibid.*

Sea Scrolls, but even if καιρός refers to such “decisive time”, what does it mean for it to be fulfilled?

Joel Marcus argues that because καιρός is used with the verb πληρόω what is being described is a span of time—not a decisive moment. For Marcus (following F. Mussner¹⁴), that span of time refers to the time of Satan’s dominion which is now being replaced by the kingly power of God.¹⁵ Marcus’ argument is based on the parallelism of the imperatives in Mark 1:15 and the larger context of Mark’s narrative. He links the imperative ‘repent’ with καιρός and ‘believe in the good news’ with βασιλεία in order to make the case that καιρός requires a negative association. Furthermore, he interprets Mark 1:13, which is the account of Jesus’ temptation by Satan in the wilderness, to be Jesus’ victory over Satan.¹⁶ Marcus also understands Jesus’ exorcisms in Mark in this light, which are possible because Jesus triumphs over Satan in the wilderness in Mark 1:13. Marcus writes, “Jesus is opposed by Satan (1:13); the continuation of the narrative suggests that this contest did not end in a draw, but rather in a defeat for Satan: his minions, the demons, shriek in terror as Jesus exorcises them (1.24, 39).”¹⁷

Although Marcus does find some support for his interpretation from parallels in the Freer Logion (in a fifth-century Greek uncial [W]), as well as the *Testament of Naphtali*,¹⁸ the actual textual evidence he cites from Mark is weak. In order for

¹⁴ F. Mussner was the original proponent of interpreting καιρός as a span of time, however, he believed that καιρός referred to the “time of waiting”. F. Mussner, “Gottesherrschaft und Sendung Jesu nach Mk 1, 14f. Zugleich ein Beitrag über die innere Struktur des Markusevangelium”, in *Praesentia Salutis. Gesammelte Studien zu Fragen und Themen des Neuen Testaments* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1967), 88.

¹⁵ Marcus argues that Mark 1:15 is about “the termination of one age and the beginning of another.” J. Marcus, “The time has been fulfilled!”, 54-56.

¹⁶ Marcus refers to Mark 1:13 as “the dethronement of Satan” and suggests that Mark’s audience also would have recognized this. Marcus, *Fulfilled*, 56.

¹⁷ Marcus, *Fulfilled*, 55.

¹⁸ *T. Naph.* 8:3-4.

Marcus' argument for the parallelism in Mark 1:15 to be accepted, one must first accept the assumption that the imperatives are associated with the preceding verbs exactly as he has demonstrated. The text, however, allows for alternatively valid interpretations. For example, one could argue that 'believe in the good news' should be paired with 'the time is fulfilled' and that 'repent' should be associated with 'the kingdom of God has come near'. Or, alternatively, perhaps the pair of indicative verbs is meant to be understood together—as the proclamation of the good news in Mark 1:14. In this case 'repent and believe' is the response to both preceding verbs which together represent Jesus' proclamation. In fact, in the Matthean parallel of this passage (Matt 4:12), the proclamation has been reduced to: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near".¹⁹ Matthew neither includes *καίρός* nor associates the imperative to believe with the kingdom of heaven (God). Instead, repentance is simply associated with the imminence of the kingdom, and not, as Marcus argues, with the time of the dominion of Satan. Consequently, although Marcus' suggestion is plausible, it requires one to accept his interpretation of the parallelism of Mark 1:15 which is too narrow and precise.

Similarly, Marcus' claim that Jesus dethrones Satan in the wilderness goes beyond the data found in Mark 1:13. Most accounts of the temptation of Jesus in the other Synoptic Gospels are somewhat lengthy, however, Mark's account is only two sentences long: *Καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ, καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ* (Mark 1:13). There are no explicit clues to suggest that Jesus has defeated Satan in any perceivable way. The text

¹⁹ Jesus' proclamation in Matthew is identical to that of John the Baptist's in Matt 3:2, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near" (*μετανοεῖτε· ἡγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*).

merely says that Jesus was being tested by Satan in the wilderness, that he was with the wild beasts, and that the angels waited on him. Even though Marcus accepts that the full realization of this can only be seen later in Mark's narrative when Jesus is exorcising demons,²⁰ the theme of Jesus' triumphant dethronement of Satan in Mark 1:13—if it is present at all—is greatly understated.

The combination of the verb 'to draw near' (ἐγγίζω) with the subject kingdom of God (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ), is an important phrase that is echoed in both Matthew and Luke.²¹ The mention of the kingdom of God in Mark 1:15 is the first of fourteen total occurrences in Mark.²² Thirteen out of these fourteen occurrences appear in the direct speech of Jesus, signifying the importance of the kingdom of God in Jesus' ministry. According to N. T. Wright, the kingdom of God was "simply a Jewish way of talking about Israel's god becoming king."²³ I. H. Marshall defines four different ways in which the kingdom of God is employed in Mark: the kingdom is something which people may enter, the kingdom is something that is to come in the future, the kingdom can be said to belong to certain people, and there is a secret about the kingdom that is shared with some people but not others.²⁴

In Mark 1:15, Jesus uses ἐγγίζω to describe the kingdom of God drawing near.²⁵ Elsewhere in Mark, ἐγγίζω is also used to describe people physically

²⁰ Marcus, *Fulfilled*, 55.

²¹ Mark's kingdom of God is changed to kingdom of heaven in Matthew, but the same verb "ἐγγίζω" is used. c.f. Matt 3:2; 4:17; 10:7; Luke 10:9,11.

²² Occurrences of kingdom of God in Mark include: Mark 1:15; 4:11, 26, 30; 9:1, 47; 10:14-15, 23-25; 12:34; 14:25; 15:43.

²³ N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 202-3.

²⁴ Marshall, *Theology*, 61.

²⁵ While most scholars maintain that ἐγγίζω denotes proximity, some argue that it means arrival in this context. E.g. C. H. Dodd. *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Charles Scriber's Sons, 1961), 4f. However, other uses of ἐγγίζω in Mark (11:1; 14:42) denote proximity and do not support Dodd's assertion. J. Jeremias and W. G. Kümmel argue that the kingdom is here but not yet fully established. W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus* (London:

drawing close. In Mark 11:1, Jesus and his disciples are drawing near Jerusalem (ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα), and in Mark 14:42 Jesus describes his betrayer as drawing close (ἰδοὺ ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικεν). In Mark 1:15, Jesus announces that the kingdom of God it is at hand, and throughout Mark's narrative there continues to be discussions of and expectations for the arrival of the kingdom of God.²⁶ In Mark 9:1, Jesus tells his disciples that some of them will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God has come "with power". And in Mark 15:43, after the death of Jesus, Joseph of Arimathea is described as a respected member of the council who is "waiting expectantly for the kingdom of God".

However, there is also a sense that when the kingdom of God arrives, not everyone will be included. For example, in Mark 10:23 Jesus teaches that it will be difficult for the wealthy to enter the kingdom of God. In Mark 10:14, Jesus remarks that whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a little child will never enter it. Furthermore, there are also indications of apocalyptic elements to the kingdom of God in texts such as Mark 9:47 which contrast 'entering the kingdom' with 'being thrown into hell'. There is a strong sense that although the coming of the kingdom of God will be 'good news' for some, it will mean judgment for others. With this knowledge, Jesus, his disciples, and even John the Baptist preached repentance in light of the coming of the kingdom of God.²⁷

A. Y. Collins warns against seeing repentance as mere "penitential discipline" or "the process of moral reform", but rather as "a turning away from

SCM, 1961), 19-25; See also J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (London: SCM; New York: Scribner's, 1963 [1947]).

²⁶ For more examples on the future aspect of the kingdom of God in Mark, see Mark 9:1; 10:23-25; 11:10; 14:25; 15:43.

²⁷ Mark 1:4, 15; 6:12. Also, as mentioned previously, in Matthew the proclamation of Jesus and John the Baptist is identical. See also Wright, *Jesus*, 182.

one's previous way of life, determined by particular sets of convictions, practices..."²⁸ Wright echoes this sentiment but suggests that this 'previous way of life' refers to Israel's spiritual exile and that a repentance on the national level is what is intended.²⁹ Repentance in many Jewish texts, Wright argues, is "what Israel must do if her exile is to come to an end".³⁰ Even if one does not adopt the entirety of Wright's theological framework pertaining to Israel as a state in exile, his reminder to ground Jesus' kingdom proclamation in Israel's story is a salient point worth taking seriously.

The paramount significance of the kingdom of God for understanding Jesus' message in the Synoptic Gospels cannot be overstated and many excellent studies on the subject have been conducted.³¹ However, it is worth noting that there is no current consensus on where the concept originates. Various proposals for a source-text have been given, including the Hebrew Bible and Hellenistic texts. Burton Mack has attempted to locate the kingdom of God proclamation in Hellenistic wisdom traditions. He argues that the exact phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ can only be found in Hellenistic texts such as Philo, Wisdom of Solomon, and *Sentences of Sextus*.³² However, Mack's view has been severely undermined by Wright who rightly criticises Mack for discarding the Jewish apocalyptic elements of Jesus' proclamation and choosing instead to understand Jesus via the lens of the "second-

²⁸ Collins, *Mark*, 155.

²⁹ Wright, *Jesus*, pp. 246-58. See also D. S. McComiskey, "Exile and the Purpose of Jesus' Parables (Mark 4:10-12; Matt 13:10-17; Luke 8:9-10)" in *JETS* 51 (2008): 73, 84-5.

³⁰ Wright, *Jesus*, 248.

³¹ Notable studies include: N. Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976); *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom* (London: SCM, 1963); R. Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and Kingdom* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963); B. Chilton, ed., *The Kingdom of God* (London: SPCK; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984); G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986); W. Willis, ed., *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrikson, 1987); D. C. Duling, "Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven" in *ABD* 4, 49-69.

³² B. L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 73.

century AD pagan moralist ‘Sextus’.”³³ C. A. Evans is similarly disapproving of Mack’s hypothesis, demonstrating that the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ can actually be found in Jewish texts as well.³⁴ Evans’ critique of Mack is scathing: “Mack’s false step shows that we cannot assume that scholars are as familiar with the primary literature as they should be.”³⁵ Evans, relying on the work of J. Schlosser,³⁶ provides an impressive survey of kingdom of God related phrases in literature from Palestinian Judaism—in Jewish prayer and liturgy, apocalyptic literature, pseudepigrapha, Qumran literature, and Alexandrian Judaism, in the Targums to the Prophets, and in rabbinic literature.³⁷ He concludes that “Jesus’ proclamation that the ‘kingdom of God has drawn near’ would have been perfectly intelligible to his Jewish Palestinian contemporaries”.³⁸ Of course, even if the kingdom of God is to be understood within the Jewish context, there are many Hebrew biblical texts which may have influenced Mark’s understanding of the expression.

Texts in the Hebrew Bible that have been proposed as influences on Mark’s kingdom of God sayings include the Psalms,³⁹ 1-2 Chronicles,⁴⁰ Isaiah,⁴¹ and Daniel. For example, Marcus argues that the influence for the theme of God’s kingly rule in Mark 1:15 is to be found in Ps 2.⁴² According to Marcus, “Psalm 2 depicts the most

³³ Wright claims that Mack avoids the apocalyptic Jesus because he has not properly understood Jewish apocalypticism and eschatology. For his critique of Mack’s, and the Jesus Seminar’s views, see Wright, *Jesus*, 210-4, quote from 213.

³⁴ Evans cites *Ps. Sol.* 17:3 and *T. Benj.* 9:1 as examples. C. A. Evans, “Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God’s Kingdom” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 2, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 491.

³⁵ Evans, “Daniel in the New Testament”, 492.

³⁶ In J. Schlosser, *Le Règne de Dieu dans les dits de Jésus* (2 vols., Ébib; Paris: Gabalda, 1980), 1, 70.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Evans, “Daniel in the New Testament”, 498.

³⁹ J. Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 66.

⁴⁰ See especially 1 Chr 28:5; 2 Chr 13:8. Evans, “Daniel”, 510.

⁴¹ Especially the Aramaic traditions of Isaiah. See especially Collins’ discussion of the interpretation of Isaiah (Isa 49:8; 52:7) in 11QMelch 2:15-16. Collins, *Mark*, 154-155.

⁴² Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 66.

intimate connection imaginable between the kingly rule of God and that of the Messiah, along with an antithetical relationship between their combined rule and the hostile βασιλεία of the earthly kings.”⁴³ However, one might argue that the vision of Dan 7—with God’s judgment of the beastly nations, as well as the kingdom being given to God’s human-like representative—conveys a similar message. In fact, Wenham suggests that “the book of Daniel may be the primary background to the Gospels’ teaching about the Kingdom”.⁴⁴ Specifically referring to the kingdom of God in Mark 1:15, Evans understands Dan 7:22 to be “the primary biblical backdrop lying behind Jesus’ proclamation that the ‘time is fulfilled’ and the ‘kingdom of God has come’”.⁴⁵ We will follow the counsel of Wenham and Evans and now turn to explore the relationship between the book of Daniel and Mark 1:15.

3.2.1.1.2 DANIEL IN MARK

Following his proclamation of the kingdom of God, Jesus explains the appropriate response to his good news: namely, repentance and belief. It is the first half of the proclamation which concerns the completion of “the time” and the imminence of the kingdom of God that is purported to be derived from Dan 7:22. LXX Dan 7:22 reads, “καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἐδόθη καὶ τὸ βασίλειον κατέσχον οἱ ἅγιοι”, and Θ has “καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἔφθασεν καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν κατέσχον οἱ ἅγιοι”. A figure comparing Mark 1:15 with the LXX, Θ, and MT versions of Dan 7:22 can be seen below:

Figure 6: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 1:15 and Dan 7:22.

Mark 1:15
“πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.”

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ D. Wenham, “The Kingdom of God and Daniel,” *ExpTim* 98 (1987), 132-34.

⁴⁵ Evans, “Daniel”, p. 512. This was first the contention of C. H. Dodd, *According to Scriptures* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952), 69.

Daniel 7:22 ⁴⁶	
LXX	καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἐδόθη καὶ τὸ βασίλειον κατέσχον οἱ ἅγιοι
Θ	καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἔφθασεν καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν κατέσχον οἱ ἅγιοι
MT	וְזָמַן מַמְלָכָהּ וּמַלְכוּתָא כְּדִישִׁין

The most striking similarity between Mark and Daniel in these texts is the occurrence of both ὁ καιρός and ἡ βασιλείαν/ τὸ βασίλειον. Notable differences include an insertion of τοῦ θεοῦ as a genitive of possession to ἡ βασιλεία in Mark that is not present in Daniel. Furthermore, ἡ βασιλεία in Mark 1:15 is in the nominative case, denoting that it is the subject of the verb, whereas in Daniel τὴν βασιλείαν/ τὸ βασίλειον is in the objective/accusative case. Also, in Daniel there is an additional subject associated with ἡ βασιλεία, namely ‘the holy ones’ (οἱ ἅγιοι), who are absent in Mark 1:15.

One of the verbs used in conjunction with τὴν βασιλείαν/ τὸ βασίλειον is lexically different in the Markan text. In Mark, the kingdom has ‘drawn near’ (ἐγγίζω), whereas in Daniel ‘the holy ones’ (οἱ ἅγιοι) ‘take hold of’ (κατέχω) the kingdom. As discussed previously, the Markan language of ‘drawing near’ is one that describes close proximity while the Danielic text speaks of the holy ones actually possessing the kingdom. However, if Mark is depending on Daniel’s vision, there may be a simple explanation for the change. Mark may be writing under the assumption that the holy ones will take hold of the kingdom. After all, Mark’s

⁴⁶ With the minor exception of the presence of a movable nu on the aorist verb φθάνω, Rahlfs’s *Septuaginta* (the version used in the table) is identical to the Ziegler’s critical edition of LXX and Θ Daniel. The one textual variant of note [LXX: ἐνέστη for ἐδόθη in Justin Martyr] will be discussed in the analysis that follows.

proclamation simply stating that the kingdom is near is not incompatible with Daniel's text. In fact, the theme of people taking hold of the kingdom of God in some way is implied throughout Mark's narrative.

The following is an extended excursus on the theme of Jesus' disciples taking hold of the kingdom through an exploration of Mark 10:14-5. In Mark 10:14, Jesus rebukes his disciples for sending away a group of parents with their children, saying that "the kingdom of God belongs to ones such as these" (τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ).⁴⁷ The corollary of this statement is seen in the following verse: "whoever does not receive the kingdom of God [ὅς ἂν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ] as a little child will never enter it" (Mark 10:15). The NRSV translates δέξηται as 'receive', however, the expression is a great deal more ambiguous in the Greek text because the term can mean "to receive something offered or transmitted by another", "to take something in hand", "to be receptive of someone", or "to indicate approval or conviction by accepting of things."⁴⁸

Apart from Mark 10:15, δέχομαι appears five other times⁴⁹ and the meaning of all of these occurrences is based on the third definition listed above: to 'receive', 'accept', or 'welcome' someone. It should be noted that the direct object of δέχομαι in each of those occurrences is a person. Mark 6:11 has to do with the disciples receiving hospitality on their missionary journey, and Mark 9:37 is Jesus' teaching about welcoming a child in his name. In contrast, when Mark wishes to convey the

⁴⁷ I am taking τῶν τοιούτων to be a genitive of possession. See the following explanation given in the interpretation of Mark 10:15.

⁴⁸ Definitions taken from BDAG, s. v. "δέχομαι". However, I have collapsed the lexicon's fourth definition ("to overcome obstacles in being receptive [to someone]) into the third definition ("to be receptive of someone") because I feel the distinction between the two is too minor to warrant an additional category.

⁴⁹ Once in Mark 6:11, four times in 9:37.

meaning of the first definition—“to receive something from another”⁵⁰—of δέχομαι, he employs the verb λαμβάνω instead. People in Mark ‘receive’ (denoted by λαμβάνω, which is synonymous with the first meaning of δέχομαι) the word (4:16), houses and fields (10:30), prayer requests (11:24), and condemnation (12:40).⁵¹ It is therefore uncharacteristic of Mark’s literary style to use δέχομαι with the meaning of “receiving the kingdom” when all throughout the gospel he uses to λαμβάνω describe such an action.

What is the meaning of the unusual usage of δέχομαι in Mark 10:15? A look through the use of δέχομαι in the rest of the New Testament will serve to illuminate the issue. Discounting the Markan occurrences and the identical synoptic parallel of Mark 10:15 in Luke 18:17, δέχομαι appears forty-nine times in the New Testament. Out of these forty-nine occurrences, twenty-eight have personal objects having to do with welcoming, receiving, and accepting someone. They are unrelated to the usage of δέχομαι in Mark 10:15. There are twenty-one uses of δέχομαι with non-personal objects, which can be further divided into three categories that align with the definitions given above.

The majority of the uses of δέχομαι with impersonal objects are with the fourth definition of δέχομαι: “to indicate approval or conviction by the accepting of things”.⁵² There are thirteen uses of δέχομαι in this way, used mostly with λόγος as

⁵⁰ Definitions taken from BDAG, s. v. “δέχομαι”.

⁵¹ Mark 10:30 also lists brothers, sisters, mothers, and children, but the sense of ‘receiving’ in this verse is quite different from the meaning of δέχομαι, which has the meaning of ‘to accept [someone]’, or ‘to welcome [someone] with hospitality’. λαμβάνω has the more general meaning of ‘being given something’.

⁵² Definitions taken from BDAG, s. v. “δέχομαι”.

the object.⁵³ For example, in Acts 11:1 the apostles and believers in Judea heard that “the Gentiles had also accepted the word of God” (ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ). In Acts 17:1, the Jews in Beroea were described as eagerly welcoming the message of Paul and Silas (ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας). Remarkably, even though BDAG also puts the use of δέχομαι in Mark 10:15 in this category, the term ‘kingdom’ does not appear as the object of δέχομαι in any of the New Testament texts—apart from Mark 10:15. The remaining eight uses of δέχομαι in the New Testament fall neatly into two groups: “taking/receiving something from someone” or “taking hold of or grasping something”.⁵⁴ Four uses of δέχομαι have the meaning of taking/receiving something from someone,⁵⁵ and the remaining four uses have the meaning of taking hold of something with no external agency apart from the taker.⁵⁶ Examples representative of this category include: Simeon taking hold of the child Jesus in his arms (Luke 2:28), Jesus taking hold of the cup at the Eucharist before passing it to his disciples (Luke 22:17), and the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians’⁵⁷ admonition to take hold of the metaphorical helmet of salvation (Eph 6:17).⁵⁸ In light of these examples, which of the meanings of δέχομαι when used with non-personal objects makes the best sense in Mark 10:15?

When examined in the context of Mark 10:15, both “taking/receiving something from someone” or “taking hold of or grasping something”⁵⁹ are possible definitions. In 10:14, Jesus rebukes his disciples for preventing children from being

⁵³ Objects of δέχομαι include love, gospel, grace, encouragement, etc. c.f. Matt 11:14; 1 Cor 2:14; 2 Cor 6:1; 8:17; 11:4; 2 Thess 2:10; and some form of the word λόγος, c.f. Luke 8:13; Acts 7:38; 8:14; 11:1; 17:11; 1 Thess 1:6; Jas 1:21.

⁵⁴ Definitions taken from BDAG, s. v. “δέχομαι”.

⁵⁵ Acts 7:59; 22:5; 28:21; Phil 4:18.

⁵⁶ Luke 2:28; 16:6; 22:17; Eph 6:17.

⁵⁷ The issue of Pauline authorship of Ephesians is irrelevant to the present discussion.

⁵⁸ This usage of δέχομαι, with the meaning ‘to take hold’ or ‘to hold fast’ is also found in the LXX. See 2 Chr 29:22.

⁵⁹ Definitions taken from BDAG, s. v. “δέχομαι”.

brought before him. The rationale behind his rebuke is that the kingdom of God belongs to “ones such as these” (Mark 10:14). From this statement comes the lesson that in fact everyone who wishes to enter the kingdom of God must receive it like a child, or take hold of it like a child. As Culpepper points out, “this scene is not really about children; it is about the kind of attitude a disciple should have.”⁶⁰ Conceptually speaking, the definition of “taking/receiving something from someone” is certainly a viable option. Although there are no other texts—apart from the Synoptic parallel in Luke 18:17—that employ δέχομαι in connection to receiving a kingdom, the concept of receiving dominion from another is not a foreign concept. Hebrews 12:28 speaks about “receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken”, and in the Book of Revelation the ten horns observed by the seer are “ten kings who have not yet received a kingdom” (Rev 17:12).

It must be noted that δέχομαι is not the verb used in these texts; παραλαμβάνω (Hebrews 12:28) and λαμβάνω (Rev 17:12) are used. And although it is rare for New Testament writers to speak about ‘receiving’ a kingdom, there are many texts that describe the action of bestowing a kingdom on someone. In Mark 6:23, Herod promises to give his daughter Herodias anything she desires, even if she asks for half of his kingdom. In Luke 12:32, Jesus declares, “Do not be afraid, little flock, for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom” (...ὅτι εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν). Therefore, the conceptual framework for the idea of someone receiving a kingdom does exist, but the question remains what it would mean for someone to receive the kingdom of God like a child.

⁶⁰ Culpepper, *Mark*, 357.

In Mark, the pericope where this saying is found is that of Jesus blessing the children, which is followed by the failed call narrative of a rich man. The rich man's inability to part with his wealth results in a failure to enter the kingdom of heaven, prompting Jesus to remark to his disciples, "How hard it will be for those who have wealth to enter the kingdom of God!"⁶¹ This is a direct contrast to Mark 10:15, in which Jesus teaches that one must receive the kingdom like a child to enter the kingdom of God.

The definition of "taking hold of or grasping something"⁶², is the least popular option among scholarly opinion but I argue that it may also be a valid interpretation. Mark characteristically employs the verb λαμβάνω, not δέχομαι when describing the action of receiving something from someone—as in the first definition. Furthermore, other uses of δέχομαι all relate to the receiving or welcoming of persons. Throughout Mark's narrative, the kingdom of God is not something one receives nor is it an idea or concept to be accepted. The use of δέχομαι in this context is therefore highly unusual. A proposal would be to read the definition of 'taking hold' metaphorically into Mark 10:15 and thus translating it as: Whoever does not take hold of the kingdom of God like a child will never enter it. This picture would provide a contrast to texts like Matt 11:12 which describe the kingdom of heaven being snatched by violent people (ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται καὶ βιασταὶ ἄρπάζουσιν αὐτήν). The emphasis in Mark 10:15 is on taking hold of the kingdom as a child would. J. A. Grassi points out that a consistent

⁶¹ Mark 10:23.

⁶² Definitions taken from BDAG, s. v. "δέχομαι".

theme in Mark is “God reversing human expectations by working through the powerless, children and little ones”.⁶³

While the Lukan parallel to this passage is identical to Mark’s text, the Matthean parallel contains some interesting modifications. Firstly, Matthew splices the saying in Mark 10:15 from the context of Jesus blessing the children into a different pericope, the Matthean episode where Jesus uses a child to teach his disciples about greatness (18:1-5).⁶⁴ Secondly, he omits the section about “receiving/taking hold of the kingdom” as a child altogether, replacing it with anyone “must change and become like children” (στραφήτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παῖδιά).⁶⁵ Matthew proceeds to explain in the next verse that whoever humbles themselves like the child (ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν ὡς τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο) will be great in the kingdom of heaven. Therefore, from Matthew’s redactions of Mark it can be seen how Matthew removes the Markan emphasis of receiving/taking hold of the kingdom and instead focuses on possessing the humility or powerlessness of a child. Perhaps Matthew also interpreted Mark’s phrasing ὅς ἂν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ as ‘taking hold of the kingdom’ and edited it to better fit his own emphases. Finally, this option might also be a suitable interpretation given the allusion to Dan 7:22 in Mark 1:15. In both LXX and Θ readings, the holy ones of the Most High possess the kingdom (τὸ βασίλειον κατέσχον/τὴν βασιλείαν κατέσχον). The verb κατέχω conveys the meaning “to possess or to hold back”, translating the Aramaic ܕܡܝܢ which means “to take possession of”.⁶⁶ However, κατέχω only appears 17 times in the New Testament, and none of those occurrences

⁶³ J. A. Grassi, “Child, Children” in *ABD*, Vol 1, p. 906.

⁶⁴ See Collins, *Mark*, 472-3.

⁶⁵ Matt 18:3.

⁶⁶ Definition taken from BDB, s. v. “2631, 2630 ܕܡܝܢ”.

are found in Mark. Therefore, it is possible for Mark to be using δέχομαι in a manner similar to κατέχω in Dan 7:22, namely “taking hold of” or “taking possession of” in Mark 10:15. In light of Jesus’ preceding statement in Mark 10:14 that the kingdom of God belongs to ones such as children, the “taking hold of” meaning of δέχομαι might also be a valid alternative to more traditional interpretations of “to receive something offered”⁶⁷ or “to indicate approval or conviction by accepting of things.”⁶⁸

Returning to the discussion of the use of Daniel in Mark 1:15, the next element to be examined is Mark’s use of πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς and Daniel’s ὁ καιρὸς ἔφθασεν/ ἐδόθη. The LXX’s translation is “the time was given (ἐδόθη)”, but Θ translates this as “the time arrived, or reached a certain position” (φθάνω)⁶⁹, which is a more literal rendering of the Aramaic word ܫܡܝܢ, meaning “to reach”. Here, the Θ reading ὁ καιρὸς ἔφθασεν is especially relevant to the Markan allusion, which employs πεπλήρωται, not to imply fulfilment but rather the completion of a span of time.⁷⁰ Ziegler’s critical edition of the LXX gives a variant reading of ἐνέστη in place of ἐδόθη in Justin Martyr.⁷¹ ἐνίστημι means “to come or to arrive”, and is used in connection with καιρός in 2 Tim 3:1 and Heb 9:9 in the New Testament.⁷² Indeed, although ἐνίστημι is only a minor variant, it corresponds well with the meaning of φθάνω, and is suggestive of how Dan 7:22 might have been understood.

⁶⁷ As in Culpepper, *Mark*, p. 357.

⁶⁸ Definition taken from BDAG, s. v. “δέχομαι”.

⁶⁹ Definition taken from BDAG, s. v. “φθάνω”.

⁷⁰ Marcus, “Fulfilled”, 54-6; Mussner, “Gottesherrschaft”, 88.

⁷¹ Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 342.

⁷² Definition taken from BDAG, s. v. “ἐνίστημι”.

φθάνω appears ten times in Θ Daniel and in each case refers to something arriving at or reaching a spatial or temporal destination.⁷³ For example, in the fourth chapter of Θ Daniel, the tree in the king's vision grows "so that its top *reached to heaven*" (τὸ ὕψος ἔφθασεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν).⁷⁴ Similarly, in Dan 6:24, the lions overpower Daniel's adversaries who were thrown into the lions' den "before they reached the bottom of the pit" (οὐκ ἔφθασαν εἰς τὸ ἕδαφος τοῦ λάκκου). These are examples with a spatial designation, but the use of φθάνω with a temporal designation can be observed in Dan 12:12 the one who perseveres and "reaches the thousand three hundred thirty-five days" (φθάσας εἰς ἡμέρας χιλίας τριακοσίας τριάκοντα πέντε) is blessed.

Although φθάνω does not appear in Mark, the Q saying attested in both Matthew and Luke also illustrates its function. The saying, which is identical in Matthew and Luke, reads "εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ." Jesus pronounces that if he casts out demons by God's spirit, then the kingdom of God "has reached/has arrived" in you.⁷⁵ The meaning of ὁ καιρὸς ἔφθασεν in Dan 7:22 is that the time has reached a certain stage, or phrased another way it would read: The time has arrived at the moment when the holy ones gain possession of the kingdom.⁷⁶ Understood in this manner, the meaning of ὁ καιρὸς ἔφθασεν is compatible with Mark's statement that the time has been completed (πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς). In essence, Mark's statement can be seen as a paraphrase of the Danielic text in a manner that does not significantly alter its meaning. Mark's application of the Danielic text to the ministry of Jesus is novel,

⁷³ Dan (Θ) 4:11, 20, 22, 24, 28; 6:25; 7:13, 22; 8:7; 12:12.

⁷⁴ Emphasis mine.

⁷⁵ Cf. Matt 12:28; Luke 11:20.

⁷⁶ This how the NRSV and NIV translate Dan 7:22 (MT).

however, his interpretation seems to be in accordance with the original meaning of Dan 7:22: the time or moment has been reached when the holy ones will gain possession of the kingdom of God.

A brief comment will need to be made regarding the LXX translation: “καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἐδόθη καὶ τὸ βασίλειον κατέσχον οἱ ἅγιοι”. Instead of βασιλεία LXX uses βασίλειος the adjective to translate the Aramaic noun מלכו, meaning “kingdom” or “rule”.⁷⁷ βασίλειος means “pertaining to a king” or “royal”, but according to BDAG, apart from Daniel it is also synonymous with βασιλεία in several other Jewish texts including *Testament of Judah* and *Sibylline Oracle*.⁷⁸

The LXX use of ἐδόθη is a rather loose and interpretive translation of the Aramaic נטנ, meaning ‘to reach’. Even though ἐδόθη is the third-person singular aorist passive indicative verb of δίδωμι, the words means much more than “the time was given” in Dan 7:22. Throughout the vision of LXX Dan 7, ἐδόθη appears six times and has a connotation of divine appointment or permission.⁷⁹ For example, in Dan 7:6, the leopard beast with the four wings of a bird on its back was given speech⁸⁰ (καὶ γλῶσσα ἐδόθη αὐτῷ). In Dan 7:11, the body of the beast was destroyed and was “given for burning of fire” (τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐδόθη εἰς καὶσιν πυρός). In Dan 7:14, the “one like a son of man” was given authority (καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία). Therefore, in the context of Dan 7:22, the time that “is given” is a divinely appointed moment. One might be tempted to read Mark 10:15 (πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς) in this light in terms of a moment of time to be fulfilled,

⁷⁷ Definition taken from BDB, s.v. “מלכו 4437”.

⁷⁸ Cf. *Test Jud* 17:6, 22f; *Sib Or* 3, 159. Definition taken from BDAG, s. v. “βασίλειος, ον”

⁷⁹ Dan 7:4, 6, 11, 14, 22.

⁸⁰ The beast is given “dominion” in the MT (שלטן) and Θ (ἐξουσία).

however, it has already been shown above that πληρόω used with a temporal object usually denotes the passage or arrival of time. Furthermore, the various uses of ἐδόθη in Daniel do not have suggestions of fulfilment, but merely indicate that what is happening is divinely approved.

The use of both ὁ καιρός and ἡ βασιλεία/ τό βασίλειον in Mark and Daniel is noteworthy.⁸¹ Apart from Dan 7:22, there are a number of texts in the LXX and Θ that contain both ὁ καιρός and ἡ βασιλεία/ τό βασίλειον, but none of these texts correspond well with the pronouncement in Mark 1:15.⁸² These texts contain ὁ καιρός and ἡ βασιλεία/ τό βασίλειον, but the connections between the terms are very different from the usages in Mark 1:15 and Dan 7:22. In both Mark 1:15 and 7:22, ὁ καιρός is a nominative subject with a verb (πεπλήρωται/ ἔφθασεν), whereas in many of these other texts, ὁ καιρός is in the dative or genitive case and governed by a preposition.⁸³ A. Y. Collins observes a parallel to Mark 1:15 in 11QMelch where the concept of kingdom is connected to a particular time (the day of salvation); but surprisingly, even though she recognizes a similar parallel in Daniel she only relegates the discussion of it to a footnote.⁸⁴

There are many Hebrew Bible and early Jewish texts that mention a specific moment, and many others texts that describe God's kingdom, but the only text that combines both terms in such close proximity as they are found in Mark 1:15 is Dan

⁸¹ Also noted by M. Casey, *Son of Man. The interpretation and influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979), 158-9. However, Casey does not agree that Mark 1:15 is a reference to Dan 7 because although the texts have these two elements in common, he considers the 'kingdom of God' to be too common of a theme to "tie down the reference to any single scriptural passage". However, as it has been shown, nowhere else can these two concepts be found in such close proximity in early Jewish literature or the Hebrew Bible.

⁸² LXX: Deut. 3:4, 21; Josh. 10:10; 1Chr 29:30; 2 Macc 9:25; Dan 4:36-37; 9:26. Theodotion: Dan 4:25, 32, 36. φθάνω does not appear in LXX Daniel.

⁸³ With the exception of 1 Chr 29:30. However, here ἡ βασιλεία and ὁ καιρός share the same verb (γίνομαι) as opposed to having distinct verbs, as in Mark 1:15 and Dan 7:22.

⁸⁴ Collins remarks that "this text (Dan 7:22) may have influenced the formulation of Mark 1:15. Collins, *Mark*, 155, fn. 122.

7:22. The Markan proclamation has no citation-formula and is not a direct quotation of Dan 7. However, given that *καὶρός* in conjunction with *βασιλεία/ βασιλείος* is not found in any other known Jewish texts prior to Mark, the Markan proclamation must surely be considered an allusion to Daniel.⁸⁵

3.2.1.1.3 FUNCTION IN MARK

What is the function of Mark 1:15's allusion to Dan 7:22? Mark 1:15 is the introduction to the gospel's presentation of the kingdom of God, which is at the core of the Markan Jesus' proclamation. Wright affirms that "we have substantial historical ground under our feet in saying that Jesus' characteristic message was the announcement of the kingdom".⁸⁶ Although the expression 'kingdom of God' does exist in a few other Jewish texts,⁸⁷ its prominence and frequency in the gospel of Mark is exceptional. Evans muses that the "emphatic qualification that the kingdom is *God's* kingdom in all probability reflects Danielic influence..."⁸⁸

Consequently, for Mark to employ an allusion to Daniel in Jesus' introductory message suggests that the kingdom of God in Mark is to be understood in some way through the scriptural lens of the vision of Dan 7. If this is indeed the case, Dan 7 is highly significant for understanding not only the introductory proclamation of Jesus—perhaps his ministry and teachings need also be re-evaluated in this light. The fuller implications of this will be discussed in the next chapter of the dissertation.

⁸⁵ Pace M. Casey, *Son of Man*, 158-9.

⁸⁶ Wright, *Jesus*, 227.

⁸⁷ Cf. *Pss Sol* 17:3; *T Benj* 9:1.

⁸⁸ Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament", 510.

3.2.2. References in Chapter 4

The editors of the NA²⁷ edition identify two further references in Mark 4,⁸⁹ a chapter that contains a series of Jesus' teachings in parables. The first reference is in relation to Jesus' statement that the mystery (τὸ μυστήριον) of the kingdom of God has been given to the disciples (Mark 4:11), and the second reference pertains to the Markan Jesus' use of a tree as an image for the kingdom (4:32). The editors of the NA²⁷ text classify both of these texts as containing references to Dan 4 and Dan 2, respectively. Both references will be examined in detail in the following discussion.

3.2.2.1 *Mark 4:11 / Dan 2:27-28, 47*

...ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ·

3.2.2.1.1 THE MARKAN CONTEXT

Mark 4:1-33 is a passage that introduces Jesus' characteristic use of parables in his teaching. In the preceding narrative, the Beelzebul controversy (Mark 3:19b-35), Jesus faces opposition from visiting Jerusalem scribes as well as his own family. It is noteworthy that the first mention of Jesus using parables in Mark is in the Beelzebul controversy where he responds to the scribes' insinuation that Jesus is possessed, and their claim that it is "by the ruler of demons he casts out demons".⁹⁰ In response to this accusation, Jesus calls them to him and speaks to them in parables (Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς·).

Watts suggests that in the Beelzebul controversy the "introduction of explicit parable terminology in the face of considered rejection sets the scene for the following section on the parables and their purpose".⁹¹ Watts' observation corresponds well with Jesus' explanation in Mark 4:11 where he makes a distinction

⁸⁹ The editors of the UBS4 do not acknowledge either of these references.

⁹⁰ Mark 3:22.

⁹¹ R. E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997), 156.

between his disciples and those ‘on the outside’ (ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω). Jesus explains that while the mystery (μυστήριον) of the kingdom is given to his disciples, for those on the outside everything is in parables (ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται).

However, A. M. Ambrozic rightly points out that there is an apparent contradiction in regard to Mark 12:12 and 4:33 where outsiders hear and understand the parables.⁹² Ambrozic observes,

It would seem that the only conclusion open to us is that the Second Gospel presents us with two opposing views on the subject. According to one view the parables are riddles, and more than riddles. They are the means whereby the outsiders are kept in darkness and impenitence. On the other hand, however, we see that the outsiders do understand the parables, and act upon their correct perception of Jesus’ claims that they contain.⁹³

Drawing from parallels in the LXX, Ambrozic suggests that the solution to the problem is to be found in understanding the parables of Jesus not primarily as teaching, but as ‘prophetic words’.⁹⁴

However, Ambrozic’s analysis suffers from an overly literal reading of the Markan text. For example, the text Ambrozic cites from Mark 4:33 where outsiders are able to understand Jesus’ teaching (τὸν λόγον καθὼς ἡδύναντο ἀκούειν) is followed by the qualification that Jesus explained everything (ἐπέλυεν πάντα) to his disciples in private (Mark 4:34). This implies that the verb ἀκούω in 4:33 does not necessarily mean “to understand”; an alternative translation would read: “with many similar parables Jesus spoke the word to them, as much as they were able to listen”. And in Mark 12:12, it appears that the chief priests, teachers of the law, and elders⁹⁵ knew that Jesus had spoken the parable of the vineyard against them (ἐγνώσαν γὰρ

⁹² A. M. Ambrozic, “Mark’s Concept of the Parable” *CBQ* 29 (1967): 220.

⁹³ Ambrozic, “Parable”, 223.

⁹⁴ Ambrozic, “Parable”, 225. However, this is an unconvincing argument, because in Mark 4:2, Jesus is explicitly described as “teaching them many things in parables” (καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλὰ).

⁹⁵ Mark 11:27.

ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν). However, knowing that the parable was directed at them does not necessarily mean that they understood the parable in the way Jesus intends. The type of understanding Jesus describes in relation to the parables is expressed via a reference to Isa 6:9 in Mark 4:12, in which ‘understanding’ refers to an appropriate theological or ethical orientation—rather than possessing knowledge about something.

In J. Arthur Baird’s study of the parables in the Synoptic Gospels, he observes that there are both parables that are explained and those that are unexplained, which illustrates that Jesus’ use of parables has multiple purposes.⁹⁶ In addition to this, is the dual function character of the parables, that for those who “have ears to hear they convey the good news of the Kingdom, but to those who refuse to listen their message is obscure”.⁹⁷ Jesus’ admonition in Mark 4:24-25 to “pay attention to what you hear” (βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε) calls attention to the divisive character of his message, namely that “to those who have, more will be given; and from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away.”⁹⁸

The passage on Jesus’ parables begins abruptly in Mark 4:1 as the scene shifts from Jesus in the house to Jesus teaching by the lake and ends with a summary statement in 4:33: “With many similar parables Jesus spoke the word to them, as much as they could understand. He did not say anything to them without using a parable. But when he was alone with his own disciples, he explained everything”.

⁹⁶ Although Baird does note that “there are almost twice as many parables explained as there are unexplained (41:22).” J. A. Baird, “A Pragmatic Approach to Parable Exegesis: Some New Evidence on Mark 4:11, 33-34” *JBL* 76 (1957), 206.

⁹⁷ Hooker, *Mark*, 120.

⁹⁸ This view is in keeping with Hooker, who believes that in Mark 4:24-25 “those who listen to Jesus will receive according to their response.” Hooker, *Mark*, 134.

Altogether, there are four parables in this section,⁹⁹ which according to the summary statement are representative of the kind of parables Jesus told.¹⁰⁰ The first parable, the parable of the sower (Mark 3:9) is accompanied by the disciples' question about the parable (Mark 4:10), which prompts Jesus to reveal his *modus operandi* in speaking in parables and to explain the parable of the sower in detail (4:11-20). The reference to Daniel appears in the rationale for speaking in parables that Jesus gives his disciples in private¹⁰¹ (4:10).

The suggestion that the book of Daniel has some part to play in Mark 4:11 is based on the argument that the use of the expression “τὸ μυστήριον” as well as the notion that God is the revealer of mystery/mysteries is derived from Dan 2.¹⁰² The only occurrences of τὸ μυστήριον in the Gospels are those which are found in Mark 4:11 and its Matthean and Lukan parallels.¹⁰³ Both Matthew and Luke change Mark's singular τὸ μυστήριον to the plural τὰ μυστήρια.¹⁰⁴ Various proposals have been given for this shift in number in Matthew and Luke.¹⁰⁵ Collins suggests that the reason for Matthew and Luke's change is because “they did not understand or care for the intention of Mark, the reference to the parable itself, but generalized the point independently.”¹⁰⁶ However, a more likely reason is that Matthew and Luke

⁹⁹ Mark 4:3-9; 21-25; 26-29; 30-32.

¹⁰⁰ “With many such parables he spoke the word to them...” (Mark 4:33)

¹⁰¹ “Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας...” (Mark 4:10).

¹⁰² E.g. Culpepper, *Mark*, 138.

¹⁰³ Despite its paucity in the Gospels, τὸ μυστήριον appears 25 times in the New Testament, most notably in Paul, but it is also found in the Book of Revelation.

¹⁰⁴ Matt 13:11; Luke 8:10.

¹⁰⁵ See Collins' discussion of the views of A. Ennulat and H. Koester, *Mark*, 247-8. See also, A. Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”: Untersuchungen zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems* (WUNT 2:62; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 124-6; H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia: Trinity; London: SCM, 1990), 279-80.

¹⁰⁶ A. Y. Collins, “The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament” in *Daniel*, J. J. Collins (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 106.

attempted to correct an inconsistency in Mark's grammar.¹⁰⁷ It would appear from Mark's use of the singular τὸ μυστήριον that he is referring to the mystery of the kingdom of God in the parable of the sower in the preceding verses; however, other data in Mark 4:10-11 suggest something more general is in view. In Mark 4:10, the disciples ask Jesus about the parables (plural: τὰς παραβολάς) in general—not specifically about the parable of the sower. In reply, Jesus responds by saying that to those on the outside everything is in parables (also plural: ἐν παραβολαῖς).¹⁰⁸ The obvious contrast in Mark 4:11 is between τὸ μυστήριον being given to Jesus' disciples (the Twelve and the ones around him [οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν]), and τὰς παραβολάς through which those on the outside are addressed. The Matthean and Lukan changes of τὸ μυστήριον to τὰ μυστήρια in order to agree with the number of ἐν παραβολαῖς merely highlights this contrast (Matt 13:11; Luke 8:10). The overarching secret in the Markan narrative is concerning Jesus (his identity as Messiah, his passion),¹⁰⁹ but τὸ μυστήριον in Mark 4:11 specifically refers to the kingdom of God.¹¹⁰

Another change that can be observed in both Matthean and Lukan parallels is the addition of the aorist infinitive γινῶναι to ὑμῖν δέδοται, qualifying the fact that the disciples are not simply given, but are given *to know* the mysteries of the

¹⁰⁷ For a fuller discussion of Mark's grammatical style and peculiarities see N. Turner, "Style" in Vol. 4 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, J. H. Moulton, et al. (eds) (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1976), 11-30; and R. H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994).

¹⁰⁸ J. Jeremias has argued that ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται derives from an Aramaic phrase meaning "everything obscure", J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, Revised ed. (London: SCM Press, 1963), 14-18. However, this suggestion is unpersuasive for the reason that τὰς παραβολάς has just been used in the regular sense of Jesus' teaching parables in Mark 4:10 and is unlikely to carry a metaphorical meaning in the same dialogue.

¹⁰⁹ Demons and various people are told not to disclose this information to others. Cf. Mark 1:25; 8:30; 9:9;

¹¹⁰ See also S. Brown, "The Secret of the Kingdom of God" (Mark 4:11) *JBL* 92, no. 1 (1973): 61. Pace Marshall, *Theology*, 81, who argues that Mark 4:11 should also be seen in relation to the Messianic secret.

kingdom of God. Collins allows for this possibility, suggesting that the addition may be “a clarification, overlooking (or correcting) the fact that in Mark the ‘giving’ of the mystery does not yet imply its ‘being known’”.¹¹¹ Collins’ suggestion is further supported by the motif of the disciples’ general lack of understanding in Mark’s narrative.¹¹² At several points in Mark’s narrative, Jesus appears to be exasperated at his disciples’ failure to understand, exclaiming on one occasion in Mark 8:21, “[D]o you still not understand?” (καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· οὐπω συνίετε;).

The theory that the Matthean and Lukan additions intentionally downplay the negative portrayal of the disciples is further supported by the omission of Mark 4:13 in both Matthew and Luke’s accounts. In the introduction to the interpretation of the parable of the sower, Jesus says to his disciples, “Do you not understand this parable? Then how will you understand all the parables?” (πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;).¹¹³ This statement is understandably absent in the Matthean and Lukan accounts because it is dissonant with their earlier claims that the disciples have been given ‘to know’ (γινῶναι τοῖς ὑμῖν δέδοται) the mysteries of God.

3.2.2.1.2 DANIEL IN MARK

It is difficult to hypothesize which version of Daniel (LXX, Θ, MT) is being employed by Mark. When compared with the supposed source-text of Dan 2:27-28 and 47, Mark 4:11 actually contains very few lexical similarities with Daniel, as can be seen in the following figure.

Figure 7: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 4.11 and Dan 2:27-28, 47.

¹¹¹ Collins, *Mark*, 248.

¹¹² For other examples of the disciples’ lack of understanding, see Mark 4:13; 6:52; 8:17, 21; 9:32; 14:68.

¹¹³ Mark 4:13.

Mark 4:11	
καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται,	
Daniel 2:27-28, 47	
LXX	<p>ἐκφωνήσας δὲ ὁ Δανιηλ ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλέως εἶπεν <u>Τὸ μυστήριον</u>,¹¹⁴ ὃ ἐώρακεν ὁ βασιλεὺς, οὐκ ἔστι σοφῶν καὶ φαρμάκων καὶ ἐπαιδῶν καὶ γαζαρηνῶν ἢ δῆλωσις, <u>28</u> ἀλλ' ἔστι θεὸς¹¹⁵ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀνακαλύπτων¹¹⁶ μυστήρια, ὃς ἐδήλωσε τῷ βασιλεῖ Ναβουχοδοноσορ ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. βασιλεῦ, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζῆθι· τὸ ἐνύπνιον καὶ τὸ ὄραμα τῆς κεφαλῆς σου ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης σου τοῦτό ἐστι.</p> <p><u>47</u> καὶ ἐκφωνήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς τὸν Δανιηλ εἶπεν· Εἰ ἀληθείας ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν βασιλέων ὁ ἐκφαίνων <u>μυστήρια</u> κρυπτὰ μόνος, ὅτι ἐδυνάσθης δηλῶσαι <u>τὸ μυστήριον</u> τοῦτο.</p>
Θ ¹¹⁷	<p>καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Δανιηλ ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ λέγει <u>Τὸ μυστήριον</u>, ὃ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπερωτᾷ, οὐκ ἔστιν σοφῶν, μάγων, ἐπαιδῶν, γαζαρηνῶν ἀναγγεῖλαι τῷ βασιλεῖ, <u>28</u> ἀλλ' ἡ ἔστιν θεὸς ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀποκαλύπτων <u>μυστήρια</u> καὶ ἐγνώρισεν τῷ βασιλεῖ Ναβουχοδοноσορ ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. τὸ ἐνύπνιον σου καὶ αἱ ὁράσεις τῆς κεφαλῆς σου ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης σου τοῦτό ἐστιν.</p> <p><u>47</u> καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τῷ Δανιηλ· Εἰ ἀληθείας ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν αὐτός ἐστιν θεὸς θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν βασιλέων καὶ ἀποκαλύπτων <u>μυστήρια</u>, ὅτι ἡδυνήθης ἀποκαλύψαι <u>τὸ μυστήριον</u> τοῦτο.</p>
MT	<p>ענה דניאל קדם מלכא ואמר רנה די מלכא שאל לא חכימין אשפין חרטמין גזרין יכלין להחוייה למלכא 28 ברם איתי אלה בשמיא גלא רנין והודע למלכא נבוכדנצר מה די להוא באחרית יומיא פחלמך וחזוי ראשך על משכבך דנה הוא</p>

¹¹⁴ In Ziegler's critical edition of the LXX, Τὸ μυστήριον is given as a textual variant and omitted from the main text. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 250.

¹¹⁵ Ziegler's critical edition has κύριος instead of θεός. Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ziegler's critical edition has φωτίζων. Ibid.

¹¹⁷ The Ziegler critical text of Θ is identical to Θ in Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*.

	<p>47 ענה מלכא לדניאל ואמר מן קשט די אלהכון הוא אלה אלהין ומרא מלכין וגלה רזין די יכלת למגלא רזה דנה</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The only identifiable overlap is the presence of τὸ μυστήριον/ רז in both Daniel and Mark.¹¹⁸ The expression τὸ μυστήριον, Collins suggests, comes from the use of the Persian loanword רז / רזן (Hebrew: רזם) in Hebrew and Aramaic texts in early Judaism.¹¹⁹

In the LXX, τὸ μυστήριον only appears twenty times, and is employed most frequently in Daniel (8 occurrences, 9 occurrences in Θ). While the term also appears in Wisdom of Solomon (4 occurrences), Sirach (4 occurrences), Tobit (2 occurrences), Judith and 2 Maccabees (1 occurrence), it is not found in any other texts in the LXX. In most of these texts τὸ μυστήριον refers to something that is secret—e.g. 2 Macc 13:20 refers to Rhodocus, a Jew who passed on secrets to the enemy (προσήγγειλεν δὲ τὰ μυστήρια τοῖς πολεμίοις Ροδοκος).

τὸ μυστήριον is employed more frequently in the Pseudepigrapha (46 occurrences), most notably in Enoch, the Sibylline Oracles, 3 Baruch, and the Lives of the Prophets. In the Pseudepigrapha, τὸ μυστήριον retains its general meaning as something secret (i.e. Gad 6:5) but also takes on a fuller sense of the mysterious plan of God in the context of apocalyptic visions in many texts.¹²⁰ For example, in *Test.*

¹¹⁸ Both singular and plural forms of the τὸ μυστήριον / רז can be found in the Danielic text (LXX, Θ, MT).

¹¹⁹ Collins, *Mark*, 248. See also R. E. Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term “Mystery” in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968).

¹²⁰ E.g. Enoch 9:6; 16:3; 103:2; Esdr 1:4; 3 Bar 1:6, 8; 2:6.

Lev. 2:10, the μυστήρια that are to be revealed to men (ἐξαγγελεῖς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις) refer to God's plan to soon redeem Israel.

The use of the Hebrew/Aramaic word מֵסֵר can also be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, as A. Collins has shown. She notes that a significant usage is to be found in the formula מֵסֵר מֵסֵר, meaning “the mystery that is to come”.¹²¹ Collins observes that מֵסֵר מֵסֵר “expresses both the fulfilment of the divine plan and the fact that only at the end will the plan become evident to all”, and is in this way analogous to the concept of τὸ μυστήριον in *Mark 4:11*.¹²²

Other commentators have also observed similarities with the use of τὸ μυστήριον in Greek mystery religions where it refers to the mystery revealed to initiates.¹²³ Initiates to a mystery religion would be provided with secret knowledge and shown secret objects during their elaborate initiation ceremonies.¹²⁴

Paul's use of τὸ μυστήριον in *Romans* and *1 Corinthians* is similar to the usage observed in the Pseudepigrapha and also the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹²⁵ In the Jewish context, τὸ μυστήριον is “a secret purpose of God which he reveals to his people”¹²⁶; for Paul, this secret purpose was God's plan to bring both Gentiles and Jews to righteousness through the gospel.¹²⁷ It is important to note that τὸ μυστήριον was used variously to describe different purposes of God, as is evidenced by the wide application of the term in early Jewish literature. Therefore, τὸ μυστήριον in *Mark 4:11* is used to convey that the teachings and proclamations of

¹²¹ See 4QInstruction^c, Collins, *Mark*, p. 248.

¹²² Ibid., p. 249.

¹²³ Hooker, *Mark*, 127; See also M. W. Meyer, “Mystery Religions”, in *ABD* Vol. 4, 942.

¹²⁴ Culpepper, *Mark*, 138.

¹²⁵ τὸ μυστήριον appears twice in *Romans*, six times in *1 Corinthians*, six times in *Ephesians*, four times in *Colossians*, once in *2 Thessalonians*, and twice in *1 Timothy*.

¹²⁶ Definition coined by Hooker, *Mark*, 127.

¹²⁷ *Rom 11:25; 16:25; Eph 3:1-9; Col 1:25-27.*

Jesus about the kingdom of God (primarily communicated through parables) are to be understood as belonging to the hidden agenda of God that is now being revealed through Jesus.

It can be seen that Mark's use of τὸ μυστήριον likely conforms to the Jewish sense of usage of the term, but is it possible to locate the source of the term? It is generally acknowledged that the earliest parts of 1 Enoch predate the book of Daniel. J. H. Charlesworth affirms that "the oldest apocalypse...is not Daniel, which is dated around 165 B.C.E., but *1 Enoch*, the earliest sections of which date from the 3rd century B.C.E."¹²⁸ However, even though 1 Enoch is earlier than Daniel, a study of the actual use of τὸ μυστήριον in 1 Enoch reveals that the Markan usage is much closer to that of Daniel.

τὸ μυστήριον appears a total of seven times in 1 Enoch: five times in the Book of the Watchers and twice in the Epistle of Enoch. In the Book of the Watchers, τὸ μυστήριον refers to the forbidden knowledge that the rebellious angel Azazel reveals to men (*1 En* 9:6; 16:3). In the Epistle of Enoch, an epistle from Enoch to his spiritual descendants refers to heavenly knowledge that Enoch attains by reading from engraved tablets in heaven (*1 En* 103:1; 104:12). The first mystery concerns good things and joy that has been prepared for the souls of the pious who have died (*1 En* 103:3). The second mystery (*1 En* 104:12) is that the books of Enoch's words will be given to the just, the pure, and the wise for the purpose of that they will have the "joy of truth" (εἰς χαρὰν ἀληθείας). It can be seen that Enoch's use of τὸ μυστήριον conveys the more general meaning of "something secret to be

¹²⁸ J. H. Charlesworth, "Pseudepigrapha, OT" in *ABD* Vol. 5, 539.

revealed” rather than describing any divine hidden purpose. A more fitting parallel to Mark 4:11 can be found in the book of Daniel.

As already mentioned above, τὸ μυστήριον appears eight times in LXX Daniel and every occurrence is found in the court narrative about Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in Dan 2.¹²⁹ The frequency and highly concentrated usage of τὸ μυστήριον in Daniel is unique, as it has been seen above, both to the LXX/ Θ and early Jewish literature. The book with the next highest number of occurrences is *1 Enoch* with 7 occurrences but, as it has been seen, these references are scattered through many different traditions and mostly are largely used to convey a sense of secret knowledge. The import of this phenomenon is highly significant because it suggests that it is very likely that a New Testament writer’s (i.e. Mark’s) understanding of τὸ μυστήριον would be influenced by Dan 2.

In the story of Dan 2, Nebuchadnezzar is so troubled by his dreams (LXX: visions and dreams [ὁράματα καὶ ἐνύπνια]) that upon pain of death he orders his wise men to interpret one of his dreams.¹³⁰ While these wise men are accustomed to such requests, the situation becomes desperate when the king demands that they interpret his dream without being told any details of the dream.¹³¹ The wise men are unable to do as the king asks and in a fit of rage, the king decrees to have all the wise men executed.¹³² In order to avert this disaster, Daniel who is also one of the wise men in the king’s court resolves to interpret the king’s dream by seeking help from the God of heaven.¹³³ The first mention of τὸ μυστήριον in the narrative is in Dan 2:18 when Daniel and his companions pray to God “concerning this mystery” (περὶ

¹²⁹ 9 occurrences in Θ, 8 occurrences are found in Dan 2, the other occurrence is found in Dan 4:9.

¹³⁰ Dan 2:1-3.

¹³¹ Dan 2:4-9.

¹³² Dan 2:10-12.

¹³³ Dan 2:14-18.

τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου). ‘This mystery’ refers to the dream of the Nebuchadnezzar and in Dan 2:19 ‘the mystery’ is revealed to Daniel in a vision. Daniel is brought before the king, and he reveals both the dream and its interpretation.¹³⁴ The king’s dream was of a great statue whose body parts were made with different materials.¹³⁵ A stone, not cut by human hands, struck the statue’s feet and shattered them. The rest of the statue breaks and disintegrates, but the stone that struck the statue becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. Daniel interprets the dream for the king by telling him that he is the head of gold, the other parts of the statue are subsequent kingdoms, and the stone that destroys the statue and fills the whole earth is the eternal kingdom of the God of heaven.¹³⁶ Daniel informs the king that he did not see the vision by his own knowledge, but emphasizes that the “God of heaven that reveals mysteries” revealed it to him.¹³⁷

Although it is unlikely that Mark 4:11 is drawing on this story in its entirety, there are interesting parallels between Dan 2 and Mark 4:11. The meaning of τὸ μυστήριον is ‘a secret to be revealed’, which in Daniel is the mystery of the king’s hidden dream. However, the king’s dream is ultimately about the kingdom of the God of heaven. The dream begins with a statue, but it is destroyed by a small rock (ὁ λίθος)¹³⁸ which replaces all the previous kingdoms, which are not only broken but pulverized and carried away by the wind (Dan 2:35). Nebuchadnezzar, represented by the golden head of the statue, is only one element of the vision. The kingdom set up by the God of heaven is the main feature of the vision. In essence, τὸ μυστήριον that God reveals to Daniel is the secret about the kingdom of the God of heaven. In

¹³⁴ Dan 2:25-45.

¹³⁵ Dan 2:31-35.

¹³⁶ Dan 2:36-45.

¹³⁷ Dan 2:27-30.

¹³⁸ The rock grows to become a “great mountain” (ἐγενήθη ὄρος μέγα). Dan 2:35 Θ.

Mark 4:11, τὸ μυστήριον is also the secret about the kingdom of God (ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ). Although no other clear references to Dan 2 can be discerned, the element in Daniel’s vision pertaining to the kingdom of the God of heaven—namely that it will start out small but eventually expand and be established beyond measure and beyond all expectation—is echoed in each of the kingdom parables Jesus tells in Mark 4. In the parable of the sower, the seed that is sown into good soil bears fruit that grows up, increases, and yields “thirty and sixty and a hundredfold” (Mark 4:8). In the parable of the man who scatters seeds on the ground, the seeds sprout and grow into maturity despite the man’s surprise and lack of understanding (Mark 4:26-29). While the man is not directly involved in the growth of the seed, representing the kingdom of God, because that part is mysterious,¹³⁹ he is expected to take part in the harvest when the grain is ripe (Mark 4:29). In the parable of the mustard seed, the kingdom of God is likened to a mustard seed, which when it is planted is “the smallest of all the seeds on earth” (Mark 4:31), but when it is sown it grows to become “the greatest of all shrubs”. The unmistakable theme common to each of these parables is that the kingdom of God, despite its humble beginning, will surely be established beyond all measure and expectation. Although the kingdom parables vary in detail from Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, the elements concerning the kingdom of God convey a similar message.

Both Wright and Evans have noted the themes that have been discussed above. Wright, in particular, observes parallels between the parable of the sower and Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in Dan 2, and argues that both the form and the content of

¹³⁹ In the parable the man would sleep and rise night and day, and it is implied that the seed grows without his involvement. c.f. Mark 4:27.

the two texts are similar.¹⁴⁰ Wright notes the three following similarities in form: each uses a cryptic story—the fate of the seeds in one and the statue made with different materials in the other—a transitional passage about God as the revealer of mysteries, and a line-by-line interpretation of the cryptic story.¹⁴¹ Wright also observes the following three similarities in content: the failed sowings (which Wright associates with the fallen statue), the unveiling of the mysterious divine plan, and most notably, the revelation of the Messiah.¹⁴² Wright draws particular attention to the fact that some Jews in the first century read the ‘stone’ that became a mountain in Dan 2 as messianic.¹⁴³ For Wright, the parable of the sower is the story of Israel’s return from exile “with a paradoxical conclusion”, and the story of Jesus is the fulfilment of Israel’s story, also “with a paradoxical outcome”.¹⁴⁴ Again, whether one agrees with Wright’s story of Israel’s return from exile, the similarities he highlights are significant to the present discussion. Evans also considers the theme of the kingdom as a “mystery” in Mark to be an influence of Daniel in Mark, and in particular Dan 2:47 in Mark 4:11.¹⁴⁵ While he acknowledges that παραβολή is the equivalent of מָשַׁל, meaning riddle or parable, he also wonders “if the hermeneutic of Daniel once again lies behind dominical language”.¹⁴⁶

Given the evidence that has been discussed it must be concluded that Mark 4:11 should also be considered an allusion to the book of Daniel. Although a single-word overlap (τὸ μυστήριον) on its own is not enough to constitute an allusion,

¹⁴⁰ Wright, *Jesus*, 231.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Wright cites the “well known play between ‘stone’ (*eben* in Hebrew) and ‘son’ (*ben*).” Ibid. See also N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 314.

¹⁴⁴ Wright, *Jesus*, 230.

¹⁴⁵ Evans, “Daniel”, 512-4.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 513.

additional data exists to support the suggestion that Mark is dependent on Daniel's tradition. For example, it has been seen that among all of the Hebrew Bible, Apocrypha, and early Jewish literature, no other text employs such a frequent and concentrated use of τὸ μυστήριον as Dan 2 does. The use of τὸ μυστήριον to refer to Nebuchadnezzar's dream, essentially the revelation about the kingdom of God, has striking parallels to Mark's own use of the term, as well as his understanding of the kingdom of God as portrayed in the kingdom parables of Mark 4. For all of these reasons, the similarities between Mark 4:11 and Dan 2 must be considered more than coincidental. Given that the singular form of μυστήριον is relegated as a textual variant in Ziegler's edition of the LXX, it is possible that Mark 4:11 is following the text of Θ.

3.2.2.1.3 FUNCTION IN MARK

The literary function of the references to Daniel in Mark 4:11 is two-fold. The first is to allude to the common Jewish understanding of τὸ μυστήριον as an element of the hidden counsel of God (especially in relation to his interactions with the world) that is to be revealed to men. This usage of τὸ μυστήριον has been evidenced by comparisons with several early Jewish texts, including the *Testament of Levi* and 4QInstruction^c, and in Paul's own texts, including Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians. Although the theme of a divine plan to be revealed is common among these writings, there is variation in the usage of τὸ μυστήριον.

It appears that Mark's use of τὸ μυστήριον also conveys this notion of the revelation of God's purpose. This is supported by Jesus' remarks immediately following his explanation of the parable of the sower. He teaches his disciples that what is hidden is really meant to be revealed, saying “οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτόν ἐὰν μὴ

ἵνα φανερωθῇ, οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν”(Mark 4:22).

The adjectives κρυπτόν and ἀπόκρυφον both describe something that is hidden.

κρυπτός (from the verb κρύπτω, meaning “to keep something from being divulged or discovered”) is an adjective that means “pertaining to being unknown because of being kept secret” and ἀπόκρυφος (from the verb ἀποκρύπτω, meaning “to keep from being known”) also means “hidden”.¹⁴⁷ Jesus explains that what is secret is only hidden in order that it may be revealed (φανερωθῇ).¹⁴⁸ In Mark’s narrative, κρυπτός, ἀπόκρυφος, and τὸ μυστήριον only appear once and are only found in Mark 4. It seems obvious from the context that these three terms are to be understood together.

Matthew’s addition to Mark’s summary statement to the parables (Mark 4:43-44) further strengthens this connection by applying the motif of hiddenness and revelation directly to the parables. Matthew includes a reference to Ps 78:1-4 (LXX: Ps 77:1-4) that reads, “I will open my mouth to speak in parables; I will proclaim what has been hidden from the foundation of the world”. The beginning of the reference (ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου) is a direct citation with the exact wording from Ps 77:2 (LXX), but the second half (ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου) is a paraphrase of Ps 77:2-4, that reads,

φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.
 ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἔγνωμεν αὐτὰ
 καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν διηγήσαντο ἡμῖν,
 οὐκ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῶν εἰς γενεὰν ἑτέραν
 ἀπαγγέλλοντες τὰς αἰνέσεις τοῦ κυρίου
 καὶ τὰς δυναστείας αὐτοῦ
 καὶ τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ, ἃ ἐποίησεν. (Ps 77:2b-4)

¹⁴⁷ Definitions taken from BDAG, c.v. “κρυπτός”, “κρύπτω”, “ἀπόκρυφος”, “ἀποκρύπτω”

¹⁴⁸ This is phrased negatively in the context of Mark 4:22. “For there is nothing hidden, except to be disclosed”

ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in Matt 13:35 most likely refers ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in the LXX, and ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα is likely to be a summary of the theme of “οὐκ ἐκρύβη ... ἀπαγγέλλοντες ”.¹⁴⁹ The psalm speaks of “not hiding from their children” but “announcing the praise of the Lord and his power, and the wonders that he performed”. The context is slightly different to that of Matt 13 and Mark 4, but the relationship between parable and the theme of revealing what is hidden is dominant in each of these texts.

If Wright is correct in his assessment of the similarities in form and content between Mark 4 and Dan 2, the second function of the reference to Daniel in Mark 4:11, is to frame the parables of the kingdom of God—especially the parable of the sower—in the structure and theological outlook of the king’s dream in Dan 2. In addition to the similarities in details between the parables and the king’s dream, the crux of the mystery revealed to Nebuchadnezzar is that the kingdom of the God of heaven is coming and it will be beyond all expectations. This is also the message of Jesus that is repeated in the kingdom parables of Mark 4.

3.2.2.2 Mark 4:32 / Dan 4:12, 21

καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιάν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεῖνὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν...

3.2.2.2.1 THE MARKAN CONTEXT

The second reference to Daniel in the fourth chapter of Mark is found in the final parable of the section located in Mark 4:30-32. In this parable, Jesus likens the kingdom of God (πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ) to a mustard seed

¹⁴⁹ A difficulty for this view is Matthew’s surprising application of Mark 4:22 to a differently themed set of teachings in his parallel in Matt 10:26ff.

that is small and insignificant when it is sown, but great and influential when it matures. The shrub is described as producing large branches (ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους) and as being capable of providing shelter for birds in its shade (ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν).¹⁵⁰ This parable echoes the theme of the previous kingdom parables, expressing the paradoxical success of the kingdom of God when it comes into fruition despite its insignificant beginnings. While the mustard seed is described as being “the smallest of all the seeds”, it will become “the greatest of all shrubs”. The main point of the parable is the contrast between the size of the ‘tiny’ seed and the ‘enormous’ bush it becomes.¹⁵¹

Empirically speaking, the mustard seed is not actually the smallest seed (the orchid seed, for example, is smaller), and the fully grown mustard plant is not very tall—ranging from only two to six feet in height.¹⁵² However, the mustard seed is used in the New Testament as a symbol for something small and insignificant.¹⁵³ For example, in Matt 17:19¹⁵⁴ Jesus explains to his disciples that they were unable to cast out a particular demon because of their lack of faith. He continues by saying that if they only had the faith like a mustard seed (ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως) nothing would be impossible for them.¹⁵⁵ The use of imagery of the mustard seed is proverbial. It is employed to describe or make a comparison with something small in size.¹⁵⁶ H. J. Cadbury notes, “No part of a language group is

¹⁵⁰ Mark 4:32.

¹⁵¹ See also Hooker, *Mark*, 136; Culpepper, *Mark*, 151.

¹⁵² See I. Jacob, W. Jacob, “Flora” in *ABD* 2, 811. Or eight to ten feet, according to J. Jeremias, *Parables*, 148. See also P. Perkins, “Mark 4:30-34,” *Int* (2002): 312.

¹⁵³ R. W. Funk, “The Looking-Glass Tree Is for the Birds: Ezekiel 17:22-24; Mark 4:30-32,” *Int* 27 (1973): 5.

¹⁵⁴ See also the Lukan parallel in Luke 17:5.

¹⁵⁵ Matt 17:19.

¹⁵⁶ I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A commentary on the Greek text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 561. H. W. Bassler, however, suggests that the image of the mustard seed is used to describe the future physical abundance of the kingdom. See B. W. Bassler, *Studies in Exegesis: Christian Critiques*

more distinctive or idiomatic than the picturesque phrases it uses for superlatives...

we have the minimum expressed by a mustard seed, the maximum by a tree or

mountain.”¹⁵⁷ The mustard seed in Mark matures into a shrub, but in the Matthean

and Lukan parallels of this parable (Matt 13:31-32 / Luke 13:18-19), the mustard

seed ultimately becomes a tree (Matt: γίνεται δένδρον/ Luke: ἐγένετο εἰς

δένδρον). The transformation of a mustard plant into a tree makes better sense of the

details that describe birds coming to nest in its branches because a mustard plant,

although large when compared to other shrubs, is not as large when compared to a

tree. And thus, the changes in Matthew and Luke further emphasize this contrast,

taking Mark’s real-life example and turning it into something more extraordinary.¹⁵⁸

The seed that becomes a shrub turns into an enormous tree.¹⁵⁹ B. W. Bassar,

however, suggests that Luke contains the original parable of the mustard seed, and

that the Matthean and Markan versions are “secondary redactional devices”.¹⁶⁰

Bassar argues that the point of the parable, which Bassar maintains to be analogous

to the parable of the leaven in Luke 13:20-21, is abundance and increased

productivity “which will afford greater ease for all living things in the Kingdom”

rather than the nature of the unfolding of the kingdom, from something small into

something great.¹⁶¹ Bassar also notes that mustard seeds are not necessarily seen as

of *Jewish Law and Rabbinic Responses, 70-300 CE* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 120-2. This is also the contention of C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1951), 191.

¹⁵⁷ H. J. Cadbury, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (New York: Macmillan, 1937; reprinted 1973) 56f.

¹⁵⁸ Hooker calls the change of the shrub to a tree in Matthew and Luke an exaggeration. Hooker, *Mark*, 136.

¹⁵⁹ In Luke 13:19, the seed turns into a tree, but in Matt 13:32, all three elements, seed, shrub, and tree are present. When the seed has matured into the greatest of the shrubs, it becomes a tree (ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῇ μείζον τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν καὶ γίνεται δένδρον).

¹⁶⁰ Bassar, *Studies*, 122.

¹⁶¹ Bassar, *Studies*, 122-3.

tiny in rabbinic materials.¹⁶² However, as Bock and Herrick clearly demonstrate, there are at least two Mishnaic texts, m. Niddah 5:2 and m. Toharot 8:8, in which the mustard seed is used as a comparison for a very small unit of measure.¹⁶³ In light of this, Bassler's proposal of the Lukan priority is unnecessary. A better interpretation is that Matthew and Luke expand Mark's parable, changing a shrub to a tree so as to exaggerate the final outcome, and perhaps making the parallel to the Old Testament reference more emphatic for readers.

3.2.2.2.2 DANIEL IN MARK

The expression “the birds of the sky” (τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), the infinitive “to live” (κατασκηνοῦν), and the detail about the branches (κλάδους) recall the language used to describe the great tree in Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Dan 4. The editors of both the Nestle-Aland and the United Bible Societies texts consider Mark 4:32 to be a reference to Dan 4.¹⁶⁴ The NA27 employs the MT versification (Dan 4:9-18), whereas the UBS4 uses the LXX/ Θ/ NRSV versification (Dan 4:12, 21). However, both references refer to the same passages, albeit in different versions and languages. The following figure offers a comparison of Mark with the Danielic texts.

Figure 8: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 4:32 and Dan 4:12, 21.

Mark 4:32
“καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναβαίνει καὶ γίνεται μείζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δυναθῆναι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν.
Daniel 4:12, 21

¹⁶² Ibid. See also R. S. Schellenberg, “The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven,” *CBQ* 71 (2009): 543.

¹⁶³ D. L. Bock and G. J. Herrick, *Jesus in Context: Background Readings for Gospel Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 107. See also B. B. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 377-78, 381.

¹⁶⁴ Both Greek New Testaments also include Ezek 17:23 and 31:6 as possible references.

<p>LXX (Dan 4:12, 21)</p>	<p>οἱ κλάδοι αὐτοῦ τῷ μήκει ὡς σταδίων τριάκοντα, καὶ ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ ἐσκίαζον πάντα τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ¹⁶⁵ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐνόσσευον¹⁶⁶. ὁ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ πολὺς καὶ ἀγαθός καὶ ἐχορήγει πᾶσι τοῖς ζώοις.</p> <p>καὶ πάντα τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰ νοσσεύοντα ἐν αὐτῷ· ἡ ἰσχύς τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ τῶν γλωσσῶν πασῶν ἕως τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ χῶραι σοὶ δουλεύουσι.</p>
<p>Θ (Dan 4:12, 21)</p>	<p>τὰ φύλλα αὐτοῦ ὥραϊα, καὶ ὁ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ πολὺς, καὶ τροφή πάντων ἐν αὐτῷ· καὶ ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ κατεσκήνουν τὰ θηρία τὰ ἄγρια, καὶ ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ κατῴκουν τὰ ὄρνεα¹⁶⁷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐτρέφετο πᾶσα σὰρξ.</p> <p>καὶ τὰ φύλλα αὐτοῦ εὐθαλῆ καὶ ὁ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ πολὺς καὶ τροφή πᾶσιν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ κατῴκουν τὰ θηρία τὰ ἄγρια καὶ ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ κατεσκήνουν τὰ ὄρνεα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ</p>
<p>MT (Dan 4:9, 18)</p>	<p>עפֿיִה שפֿיר ואנבֿה שגֿיא ומזון לכלֿא בה תחתוהי תמלֿל חיות ברא ובענפֿוהי ידרון ידורן צפֿרי שמיא ומנה יתזין כל בשרא</p> <p>ועפֿיִה שפֿיר ואנבֿה שגֿיא ומזון לכלֿא בה תחתוהי תדור חיות ברא ובענפֿוהי ישכנן צפֿרי שמיא</p>

If Mark is making a reference to a certain text of Daniel, it is not immediately clear which version (MT, LXX or Θ) he relies on. The Markan text appears to have similarities and differences with each of the Greek Old Testament texts, but not an affinity with any one particular text. For example, the word Mark uses for “bird” is

¹⁶⁵ Ziegler’s critical edition of the LXX ἐν αὐτῷ appears after τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 292.

¹⁶⁶ Ziegler’s edition inserts τὰς νοσσιὰς ἑαυτῶν (their nests). Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ziegler’s edition gives several variants that read τὰ πατεινὰ: V 230’ Chr.^{comm} Tht.^p. Ibid. 293.

πετεινόν, the same word that is used in the LXX. The word used for “bird” in Θ is ὄρνειον. However, the word Mark uses to describe the birds nesting in the tree is κατασκηνώω, the same word which is used in Θ in Dan 4:21.¹⁶⁸ The word used in the LXX is νοσσεύω, meaning “to build a nest”.¹⁶⁹ Mark’s reference does not appear to depend solely on either of the Greek versions.¹⁷⁰

Did Mark refer to Daniel, and if so which text did he use? Crossan argues that the Old Testament references are neither literal nor appropriate to the parable,¹⁷¹ but perhaps the similarities all three Greek texts share provide clues towards a solution. All three Greek texts modify “the birds”, regardless of whether they are using πετεινόν or ὄρνειον, with the genitive τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, “of the sky”. All three Greek texts mention the tree or shrub’s branches (κλάδοι) with a preposition (Mark: ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ LXX/ Θ: ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ) referring to a location under the tree or the branches. All three Greek texts contain all four elements of “the branches”, “under the tree/branches”, “the birds of the sky”, and the birds “living” in the tree/branches. A comparison of Mark 4:32 and Dan 4:12 in the LXX and Θ reveals that the idea of the birds living in the tree is represented by a different word in each text: ἐνόσσευον in the LXX, κατῴκουν in Θ, and κατασκηνοῦν in Mark. How should one account for these similarities? A possible solution is that either Mark relied on a variant form of Θ or an Aramaic text (i.e. from the Masoretic Text) as the source of his reference.

¹⁶⁸ Dan 4:12 Θ translates “to live” as κατοικέω.

¹⁶⁹ Definition taken from Liddell and Scott, c. v. “νοσσεύω” and “νεοσσεύω”.

¹⁷⁰ Ziegler’s edition does edition gives several variants that read πατεῖνα instead of ὄρνειον, suggesting that Mark may have followed a text that was similar to a variant reading of Θ. However, Θ also uses ὄρνειον in Dan 4:12 but there no variant reading with πατεῖνα exists.

¹⁷¹ J. D. Crossan, “The Seed Parables of Jesus,” *JBL* 92, no. 2 (1973): 255, 257.

Unless Mark is relying on a no longer extant Greek version of the Old Testament,¹⁷² the theory that Mark relies on the Masoretic Text and includes his own translation into Greek makes good sense of each of the above observations. The variation in the translation of “the birds” together with the presence of τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in all three Greek texts implies a reliance on a common source. While there are multiple ways to translate צִפּוֹר (πετεινόν and ὄρνεον are synonyms for “bird”), שָׁמַיִם (Heb: שָׁמַיִם) is usually only translated as οὐρανός.¹⁷³ This could account for the variations observed in the three Greek texts, which can be understood as independent translations of the Aramaic. The expression τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in Daniel is a contrast to τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς (Θ: τὰ θηρία τὰ ἄγρια), the beasts of the earth. Because the image in Mark is of a shrub and not a tree, the author may have chosen to omit the accompanying reference to the beasts of the earth. The poetic language used to describe creation, juxtaposing τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ with other creatures of the earth or the sea, is not exclusively Danielic; it is a common literary technique in the Hebrew Bible. For example, in Gen 1:26 God gives man dominion over the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky, the animals of the land (τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν τῶν ἑρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς).¹⁷⁴ This language from Genesis is observed in many other texts, most notably in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Psalms.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷² The alternative solution would be for Mark to rely on a variant Θ text. See footnote 170.

¹⁷³ שָׁמַיִם appears 421 times in the Masoretic Text, and only in three cases is a word other than οὐρανός used to translate it. Cf. Job 22:12; Prov 23:5; 30:19.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Gen 1:28, 2:20; 6:7; 7:3;

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Jer 7:33; 15:3; 16:4; 19:7; 34:20; Ezek 29:5; 31:6, 13; 32:4; 38:20; Ps 8:8; 50:11; 79:2.

While all three Greek texts make mentions of branches (κλάδοι), the Markan preposition referring to the location under the tree differs from both the LXX and Θ. The LXX and Θ readings are ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ whereas in Mark the expression is “under its shadow” (ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ). As seen in the previous example, it is likely here also that Mark’s text is a translation of the Aramaic “under it, it was shaded” (תחתיה תמלל) in Dan 4:9 MT, rather than relying on either of the Greek versions. The LXX rendering of the aph’el stem (causative) verb תמלל, meaning “to have shade”,¹⁷⁶ is fairly close to its meaning in the MT: καὶ ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ ἐσκιάζον πάντα τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς.¹⁷⁷ The verb σκιάζω, meaning to overshadow,¹⁷⁸ conveys the meaning of the Aramaic תמלל. Θ does not directly translate this verb, assuming the meaning of “overshadow” to be implicit in the prepositional phrase ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ. The Markan version, however, does retain the image of the shadow of the shrub but does so in language that is different to that of the LXX. Instead of employing a verb, as the LXX has done, Mark uses the cognate noun σκιά, meaning “shade or shelter from light”.¹⁷⁹ Again, here is evidence that even though there are similarities between Mark and the LXX, Mark is dependent on another source.

The combination of “the birds of the sky” used in connection with the description of the branches of a tree and being under its shade are only found in two texts in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 4 and Ezek 31:6.¹⁸⁰ However, A. Y. Collins suggests that Ezek 17, not Daniel, should be seen as the influence for Mark 4:32 and that the

¹⁷⁶ Definition taken from BDB, s.v. “2927, 2926, 6751 תמלל”.

¹⁷⁷ Dan 4:12 LXX.

¹⁷⁸ Definition taken from BDAG, s.v. “σκιάζω”.

¹⁷⁹ Definition taken from BDAG, s. v. “σκιά, ας, ῆ”.

¹⁸⁰ A. Laquoque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976), 77, suggests that Ezek 31:2-18 is the source for the imagery of Dan 4.

Markan text is a satire of the great cedar image.¹⁸¹ Ezekiel 17 is a political allegory in which God will plant a twig from the cedar that will become a great tree. Particularly, in Ezek 17:23, there is a description that the beasts will live under its shadow, and that birds will nest in its branches. While Ezekiel 17:23 seems remarkably similar to Mark 4:32, upon closer examination both similarities and differences emerge, suggesting that a literary dependency is not as clear as Collins supposes. Even though the same word for bird, πετεινόν, is used in both, Mark's use of the word is plural (τὰ πετεινα) and the use in Ezekiel is singular (πᾶν πετεινόν), faithfully translating the Hebrew phrase כָּל צִפּוֹר. The modifier "of the sky" (τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) of Mark 4:32 and the Danielic texts is also not found in Ezekiel 17. The word for branches in Mark 4:32, κλάδοι, is also different from that used in Ezekiel 17:23, κλήματα. The verb used to describe the birds living in the branches in Mark is κατασκηνώω and in Ezekiel, it is ἀναπαύω. The one similarity that Mark 4:32 and Ezekiel 17:23 LXX share over against the Greek Danielic versions are the words "under its shadow" (ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ). Although the words ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ are found verbatim in Mark 4:32, the lack of accordance with the other details in Ezekiel, plus the possibility that the phrase could also be a translation of the Aramaic כָּל צִפּוֹר in Daniel, suggests that the overlap in wording must be coincidental. One might suggest that the differences between Mark and Ezekiel (LXX) can also be attributed to Mark's dependence on his own translation or his access to a Hebrew version of Ezekiel rather than the LXX. This is entirely possible, but since Mark 4:32 shares more details with Dan 4 than Ezek 17, there is more evidence for a dependence on the Danielic text rather than Ezekiel.

¹⁸¹ Collins, *Mark*, p. 255. See also Funk, "Looking-Glass", 7-8.

The use of different words to describe the birds of the sky living in the tree, ἐνόσσευσον in the LXX, κατῶκουν in Θ, and κατασκηνοῦν in Mark also suggests that they are not interdependent but are in fact relying on a common source. The Aramaic word describing the habitation of the birds in the tree is דִּוּר in Dan 4:9 and שִׁכְנָן Dan 4:18. Θ translates דִּוּר with the verb κατοικέω and שִׁכְנָן with κατασκηνοῦν. LXX translates both דִּוּר and שִׁכְנָן with νοσσεύω.¹⁸² It is unclear whether Mark is using Dan 4:9 MT or Dan 4:18 MT because the details in Mark 4:32 could be applied to either context.

So far it has been suggested that Daniel is the influence for Mark 4:32, but this view is not without its difficulties. For example, it can be seen that if Mark took the imagery of the birds of the sky from Daniel, he omits the detail about the beasts of the field but retains the element of being “under its shade”. In the context of Daniel, the detail about being “under its shade” actually refers to the beasts and not the birds. It is the beasts of the field that live under the tree; the birds of the sky live in the tree’s branches. However, in Mark 4:32, these details are conflated and produce a rather different picture. The shrub is described as maturing into the largest of the shrubs and producing large branches, under the shade of which the birds of the sky are able to dwell.

An alternate solution can be found by attributing the source of Mark 4:32 to Ezek 31:5-6, rather than Daniel. This is the only other text in the Hebrew Bible with the group of images of the birds of the sky, the branches, and being under a tree’s shade. In Ezek 31:5, there is an additional detail not found in the Danielic vision: the

¹⁸² The LXX does not correspond well with the MT at Dan 4:18 MT. νοσσεύω in Dan 4:18 LXX is used as a substantival participle to describe the birds of the sky (τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰ νοσσεύοντα).

growing of the branches (καὶ ἐπλατύνθησαν οἱ κλάδοι αὐτοῦ) which accords with the shrub in Mark 4:32 that produces large branches. However, the same difficulties observed when attributing literary dependence to Daniel are also present in Ezek 31:6.

ἐν τῇ σκιᾷ αὐτοῦ refers to all the multitudes of nations (πάν πληθος ἐθνῶν).¹⁸³ The creatures living “under” the branches are not the birds, but the beasts of the plain (καὶ ὑποκάτω τῶν κλάδων αὐτοῦ ἐγεννῶσαν πάντα τὰ θηρία τοῦ πεδίου).¹⁸⁴ The words used to describe habitation in the tree/shrub are dissimilar (Mark: κατασκηνοῶ ; LXX: νοσσεύω). Therefore, from a lexical and grammatical perspective, it is plausible that Mark 4:32 referenced either of these texts.

However, how do either of the themes of Ezek 31 or Dan 4 agree with the parable of the mustard seed? Ezek 31 is an oracle of judgment against Egypt, using the image of Assyria as a cedar tree as an example. The tale of Assyria’s demise is told through the descriptions of a great tree in which the birds of the sky live that is cut down, so that “no trees by the waters may grow to lofty height or set their tops among the clouds”.¹⁸⁵ The oracle ends with these harsh words,

Which among the trees of Eden was like you in glory and in greatness? Now you shall be brought down with the trees of Eden to the world below; you shall lie among the uncircumcised, with those who are killed by the sword. This is Pharaoh and all his horde, says the Lord GOD. (Ezek 31:18)

The connotations with the greatness of the Egyptian kingdom are entirely negative, and the image that is described is one of devastating judgment. There is not hope for the trees that are brought down “to the world below. It seems unlikely that Mark

¹⁸³ Ezek 31:6.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Ezek 31:14.

would employ such an overwhelmingly negative image to describe the kingdom of God.

In Dan 4, a very similar story of a tree is narrated but it appears in a different setting. King Nebuchadnezzar recounts a dream that is interpreted for him by Daniel.¹⁸⁶ Nebuchadnezzar describes his dream, in which a formidable tree in which the birds of the sky live at the centre of the earth that reaches to heaven.¹⁸⁷ This tree, which Daniel reveals to be Nebuchadnezzar, is cut down and has its branches chopped off. However, whereas in Ezekiel the Assyrian kingdom that is represented by the tree is utterly condemned, there is hope for Nebuchadnezzar. In Dan 4:15, the “holy watcher” from heaven commands that the stump and roots of the tree be left in the ground. The dream comes true and Nebuchadnezzar becomes insane. He was “driven away from human society, ate grass like oxen...until his hair grew as long as eagles’ feathers and his nails became like birds’ claws”.¹⁸⁸ After a period of time, his reason returns to him and he acknowledges the God “Most High”.¹⁸⁹ Through the ordeal, the Nebuchadnezzar learns that “the Most High has sovereignty over the kingdom of mortals and gives it to whom he will”, and that the kingdom is ultimately returned to him.¹⁹⁰ Consequently, although the image of the tree kingdom in Ezek 31 is ultimately condemned, the tree kingdom of Dan 4 is not. In Dan 4, the kingdom is restored to Nebuchadnezzar, and “still more greatness was added” to him.¹⁹¹ The kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar, symbolized in the image of the great tree, does not

¹⁸⁶ Dan 4:1-8.

¹⁸⁷ Dan 4:10-11.

¹⁸⁸ Dan 4:33.

¹⁸⁹ Dan 4:17.

¹⁹⁰ Dan 4:32, 36-37.

¹⁹¹ Dan 4:36.

have any negative connotations. The judgment of Nebuchadnezzar is related to his pride and his failure to acknowledge the “Most High” God.¹⁹²

It cannot be determined definitively, strictly on the basis of lexical or grammatical analyses whether Mark was influenced by Dan 4 or Ezek 31. However, from the argument of conceptual coherence, Dan 4 is more likely to be inspiration for Mark than Ezek 31. The cedar in Ezekiel represents Israel’s enemy Assyria and is used as a pronouncement against Egypt. The tree in Daniel represents the majesty and splendour of Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom in a story about a foreign king who learns to acknowledge the sovereignty of the God. When these two conceptual backgrounds are compared, Daniel’s vision of the tree is seen to be more compatible with Mark 4:31-32, which is a parable about the kingdom of God maturing into a triumphant and majestic kingdom. Therefore, Mark 4:31-32 should be considered an intertextual use of Dan 2.¹⁹³

3.2.2.2.3 FUNCTION IN MARK

The parable of the mustard seed in Mark 4:30-32 is technically a simile, a simple comparison between the kingdom of God and a mustard seed, without any further explanation of or comment on the parable. The crux of the parable can be observed in Mark’s contrast of the mustard seed being “the smallest of all seeds on earth” and its development into “the greatest of all shrubs”.¹⁹⁴ The additional elements of the branches and the birds living in its shade in the parable in v. 32 are all elaborations of the success and glory of the kingdom. The reference to Dan 4 is only appropriate to

¹⁹² Dan 4:17.

¹⁹³ Collins, though not certain whether the influence is from Daniel or Ezekiel, writes, “The contrast between the mustard shrub and the great world tree [in Daniel] or the cedar of Lebanon was probably deliberate in the teaching of Jesus”. A. Y. Collins, “Influence”, 107.

¹⁹⁴ Mark 4:31-32. See also Culpepper, *Mark*, 151.

the latter half of the parable because the tree in Nebuchadnezzar's dream does not begin as something insignificant like the mustard seed.¹⁹⁵ On the contrary, the focus in the beginning is on the impressive stature of the tree. Therefore, the literary function of the reference to Dan 4 is to describe the future triumph of the kingdom of God in Danielic kingdom language and imagery.

3.2.3. References in Chapter 9

3.2.3.1 *Mark 9:3 / Dan 7:9*

καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν...

3.2.3.1.1 THE MARKAN CONTEXT

According to the editors of the NA27, the ninth chapter of Mark's gospel contains one reference to Daniel, in the epiphany moment of the transfiguration of Jesus in Mark 9:2-8. In this episode, Jesus leads three of his disciples, Peter, James and John, up a high mountain (ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν) whereupon he is transfigured before them (μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν).¹⁹⁶ Jesus' garments are described shining and exceedingly white (καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν), and Moses and Elijah appear and converse with him.¹⁹⁷ A cloud overshadows them, and a voice from the cloud addresses the disciples, saying, "This is my Son, the Beloved; listen to him!"¹⁹⁸ After the epiphany has concluded, Jesus warns the disciples not to disclose what they have seen until after he had risen from the dead.¹⁹⁹ Some scholars have compared the dazzling white garments of Jesus to the divine epiphanies that occur in Greek myths where the divine subject is

¹⁹⁵ The king's dream begins with, "[T]here was a tree at the center of the earth, and its height was great..." (Dan 4:10)

¹⁹⁶ Mark 9:2.

¹⁹⁷ Mark 9:4.

¹⁹⁸ Mark 9:7.

¹⁹⁹ Mark 9:9.

illuminated.²⁰⁰ However, closer parallels can be found in Jewish influences and the context of the New Testament.

D. Lose suggests that the focus of Jesus' white clothing in Mark 9:1 is a foreshadowing of his resurrection.²⁰¹ His argument is based on similarities between the transfiguration and the resurrection narrative, namely the appearance of the angels in white at Jesus' tomb in Mark 16:5 and the reaction of the women at the tomb in 16:8. However, Lose's suggestion does not take into account the motif of using white to represent heavenly beings, which may or may not have been resurrected. Instead, J. P. Heil suggests that the transfiguration narrative depicts Jesus as one who is temporarily transfigured into a heavenly being:²⁰² "His transformation into a heavenly figure facilitates his appearance and conversation with Moses and Elijah, who have already become members of the heavenly world."²⁰³ In the Matthean and Lukan parallels, Jesus' face is also transformed so that it is shining and radiant, but this feature is absent in Mark's account.²⁰⁴ P. Foster observes that the element of the radiant visage resonates with Jewish messianic expectations.²⁰⁵ The white clothing of the transfigured Jesus, however, is recounted in all three gospels. In Matthew, Jesus' garments become "as white as light" (τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς), and in Luke they "flash as with

²⁰⁰ C. R. Moss, "The Transfiguration: An Exercise in Markan Accommodation" in *Biblical Interpretation* 12:4 (2004), p. 79

²⁰¹ D. J. Lose, "What Does This Mean? A Four-Part Exercise in Reading Mark 9:2-9 (Transfiguration)" in *Word & World* 23 (2003): 89. For a contrary view see R. H. Stein, "Is the Transfiguration a Misplaced Resurrection-Account?" *JBL* 95:1 (1976): 79-96; see also B. Witherington III, "Transfigured Understanding: A Critical Note on Mark 9:2-13 as a Parousia View," *Ashland Theological Journal* 24 (1992): 88-91.

²⁰² J. P. Heil, *The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-36* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2000), 78.

²⁰³ Heil, *Transfiguration*, 80.

²⁰⁴ Matt 17:2; Luke 9:29.

²⁰⁵ P. Foster, "Polymorphic Christology," *JTS* 58 (2007): 69.

lighting”²⁰⁶ (ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων).²⁰⁷ Mark describes Jesus’ garments as become exceedingly radiant and white (τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν), with an emphasis that no one on earth could cause clothing to become like this (οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι).

Heil suggests that the whiteness of Jesus’ clothing indicates that he is temporarily transformed into a heavenly being,²⁰⁸ and there are many texts that support his suggestion. In Mark 16:5, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of Jesus, and Salome encounter an angel at Jesus’ tomb who is wearing a white robe (περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν). A comparison with the Matthean parallel of this angelophany reveals that Matthew also employs the same language to describe the angel at Jesus’ tomb as that used about Jesus at the transfiguration. The appearance of the angel at Jesus’ tomb is described as being like lightning and his clothing being white as snow (ἦν δὲ ἡ εἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπὴ καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡς χιῶν).²⁰⁹ Therefore, for Matthew the language of the transfiguration is not unique to Jesus, descriptions of radiance and white clothing is merely language employed to describe a heavenly being. Although Mark’s episodes only mention the detail of the white clothing, it is likely that Mark also intends for it to be perceived as a description of a heavenly being. Mark’s qualification in the transfiguration that no one *on earth* is able to make clothes that white supports this view.²¹⁰ In the writings of Luke, the feature of white or dazzling garments alone can be an indication of a being’s heavenly status. The two men at the empty tomb of Jesus in Luke 24:4 are described as being clothed in dazzling garments (ἐν ἐσθῇτι ἀστραπτύσει). In Acts

²⁰⁶ Definition taken from Liddell and Scott, s.v. “ἐξ–αστράπτω,”.

²⁰⁷ Matt 17:2.

²⁰⁸ Heil, Transfiguration, 84.

²⁰⁹ Matt 28:3.

²¹⁰ Mark 9:3b.

1:10, two men dressed in white (ἐν ἐσθήσεσι λευκάις) appear to the disciples as they witness the ascension of Jesus to heaven. It is clear that the figures in both these texts are to be understood as angelic beings, with the only description of their appearance being their white apparel. Even in the narrative of Mary at Jesus' tomb in the Gospel of John, the two angels Mary sees are described as being in white (καὶ θεωρεῖ δύο ἄγγέλους ἐν λευκοῖς).²¹¹

As a matter of fact, every mention of white garments in the Synoptic Gospels is associated with either Jesus' transfiguration or angelic beings.²¹² In addition, the theme of white garments as symbols for heavenly apparel is widespread in the book of Revelation. The twenty-four elders seated on the throne are dressed in white robes (ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς).²¹³ The martyrs in Rev 6:11 are given white robes (καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἐκάστῳ στολὴ λευκὴ) and are told to wait a little longer until the divinely appointed number of martyrs was complete. In Rev 7:9, the multitude standing before the throne and the lamb are robed in white (περιβεβλημένους στολὰς λευκάς) and holding palm branches. The armies of heaven of Rev 19:14 are clothed in fine linen which is pure white (ἐνδεδυμένοι βύσσινον λευκὸν καθρόν). The reward for those "who conquer" in the church of Sardis is that they will be clothed in white (περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς).²¹⁴ All these texts serve as important data demonstrating that, at least in the New Testament, being dressed in white is closely related to the heavenly realm.

3.2.3.1.2 DANIEL IN MARK

²¹¹ John 20:11-12.

²¹² Matt 17:2; 28:3; Mark 9:3; 16:5; Luke 9:29; John 20:12.

²¹³ Rev 4:4.

²¹⁴ Rev 3:4.

The suggested reference to Daniel concerns Mark's detail regarding Jesus' garments being exceedingly white, as discussed above. The Danielic texts (Dan 7:9) are provided below for comparison with Mark 9:3.

Figure 9: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 9:3 and Dan 7:9.

Mark 9:3	
καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν, οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκάναι.	
Daniel 7:9	
LXX	ἐθεώρουν ἕως ὅτε θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν, καὶ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν ἐκάθητο ἔχων περιβολὴν ὥσει χιόνα, καὶ τὸ τρίχωμα τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὥσει ἔριον λευκὸν καθαρὸν, ὁ θρόνος ὥσει φλόξ πυρός ²¹⁶
Θ	ἐθεώρουν ἕως ὅτου θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν, καὶ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν ἐκάθητο, καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ὥσει χιών λευκόν, καὶ ἡ θριξ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὥσει ἔριον καθαρὸν, ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ φλόξ πυρός, οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον·
MT	חזת הוית עד די ברסון רמיו ועתיק יומין יתב לבושה בתלג חור ושער ראשה כעמר נקא ברסיה שביבין די נור גלגלודי נור

Dan 7:1-14 narrates Daniel's vision of the judgment of the four beasts in the heavenly court. Dan 7:2-8 includes various details describing the four beasts in appearance as well as their deplorable behaviour. Following, in Dan 7:9-10, the Ancient One takes his seat on the throne and the trial begins: "[t]he court sat in judgment, and the books were open." In Dan 7:9, the text that is suggested to be

²¹⁵ Ziegler's critical edition has ὅτου instead of ὅτε. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 336.

²¹⁶ Ziegler's edition has ποταμὸς πυρός instead of φλόξ πυρός. Ibid.

alluded to by Mark, is a physical description of the Ancient One as he enters the heavenly scene. The Ancient One is described as having clothing “like snow” in the LXX (ἔχων περιβολὴν ὡσεὶ χιόνα) and clothing “like white snow” in Θ (τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ χιῶν λευκόν). The Θ translation, with the modifier “white”, is a more literal translation of the Aramaic text than the LXX: לְבוּשָׁה כְּתֵלֵג חוּר.

However, apart from the common use of the word λευκός between Mark 9:3 and Dan 7:9 Θ, there are no other linguistic similarities between Mark and Daniel. The Markan text does not employ the simile “like snow” in describing the whiteness of the clothing, as the LXX, Θ, and MT texts do. Three different terms are used for clothing in each of the Greek texts: ἱμάτιον (pl.) in Mark, περιβολή (sg.) in the LXX, and ἔνδυμα (sg.) in Θ.²¹⁷ Furthermore, the Markan element of Jesus’ clothing “shining” (neuter plural participle of στίλβω) has no parallel in the Danielic vision. Finally, the Markan text does not attribute any other features of the Ancient One to Jesus, neither his woolly hair nor his fiery throne. Surprisingly, the Matthean and Lukan parallels, which are expanded versions of Mark’s narrative, also do not include any additional elements from the descriptions of the Ancient One. The detail they do include, a change of appearance in Jesus’ face, is not derived from Dan 7.²¹⁸ Hence, from a lexical and grammatical perspective, there is little support for the argument that Mark references Daniel.

From a conceptual perspective, there is also a formidable difficulty in accepting the Markan use of Daniel in Mark 9:3. As Heil observes, the language of the transfiguration of Jesus is used to proleptically portray his transformation into a

²¹⁷ The Aramaic term, לְבוּשָׁה, is also singular.

²¹⁸ Matt 17:2; Luke 9:29. There is no mention of the face of the Ancient One in Dan 7.

heavenly being by God.²¹⁹ However, the language and imagery used in Dan 7:9 is used to describe God as the Ancient One in the vision of Dan 7. It would surely be overstepping the evidence to suggest Mark is describing Jesus in the language of God in Mark 9:3 because the Markan text only mentions that the Jesus' clothing became exceedingly white.

It has been explored above that the motif of white garments appears in many other contexts and is not used exclusively to describe God. White garments are used to describe heavenly beings, including angels on earth and other figures in heaven. The import of the transfiguration is not to portray Jesus in terms of God, but to demonstrate to the disciples the special status of Jesus as God's beloved son.²²⁰ At the end of Mark's transfiguration narrative God speaks through a cloud to the disciples, revealing Jesus' identity as God's beloved son and commanding them to obey him.²²¹ Consequently, for Mark to reference Dan 7:9, a text describing God, to refer to Jesus would undercut the distinctiveness of God that is preserved in the text, i.e. in that God has a speaking role at the end of the narrative. However, it should be noted that while it is unusual for Jesus to be depicted as the Ancient One, the book of Revelation employs Danielic language to portray Jesus as both "one like a son of man" and the Ancient One.²²²

Heil's study of Jesus' white garment in the transfiguration narratives identifies several other texts that associate white clothing with heavenly status.²²³ 1 Enoch 14:20 is a similar text to Dan 7:9 which describes the clothing of God as

²¹⁹ Heil, *Transfiguration*, p. 92.

²²⁰ "For Mark's readers, the story spells out the truth about Jesus and confirms their belief in him as God's beloved son." Hooker, *Mark*, 214.

²²¹ Mark 4:7.

²²² Rev 1:12-16.

²²³ Heil, *Transfiguration*, 86.

“whiter than any snow” and also includes the mention of the face of God. In 2 Macc 11:6-7, the people pray for God to send a good angel to save Israel and in 2 Macc 11:8 God sends a horseman in white clothing with golden weapons (ἐφάνη προηγούμενος αὐτῶν ἔφιππος ἐν λευκῇ ἐσθῆτι πανοπλίαν χρυσῆν κραδαίνων). The white apparel of the rider signifies that he is the heavenly deliverer for whom the people prayed.²²⁴ In 1 Enoch 71:1, Enoch sees in heaven the sons of the holy angels, whose “garments were white—and their overcoats—and the light of their faces was like snow”.²²⁵ Heil also notes an example in Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, in which Sedecla the witch of Endor describes the then deceased Samuel’s appearance to Saul. Samuel is described as wearing a white robe, and Heil argues that it should not be understood to refer to his funeral shroud, but that Samuel’s white robe indicates his status as a divine being.²²⁶ Finally, there are several other texts in which the righteous in heaven are given glorious garments.²²⁷ An example of this can be seen in 4 Ezra 2:39, “Those who have departed from the shadow of this age have received glorious garments from the Lord.”²²⁸ Therefore, being dressed in white, glorious garments, is not restricted to God alone, but also applies to angelic beings and exalted men.

In view of the above information and given the lack of accordance between Mark 9:3 and Dan 7:9 coupled with the relatively widespread use of the theme of white clothing referring to someone from the heavenly realm, it is unlikely that Mark makes use of Daniel at this point in the narrative. Therefore, although Dan 7:9 and Mark 9:3 share the use of the word λευκός, Mark 9:3 should not be considered a

²²⁴ Ibid., 87.

²²⁵ Translation by E. Isaac,”1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” *OTP* 1.21 (1983), 49.

²²⁶ Heil, *Transfiguration*, 87-88.

²²⁷ 4 Ezra 2:39; 1 Enoch 62:15; 2 Enoch 22:8-10.

²²⁸ 2 Esdr 2:39 (NRSV).

reference, exclusive or otherwise, to Daniel. Since Mark 9:3 most likely does not make reference to Dan 7:9, the literary function of the Danielic reference will not be discussed.

3.2.4. References in Chapter 13

According to the editors of the Greek New Testaments, Mark 13 contains the highest concentration of Danielic references in the whole book with five occurrences.²²⁹ This is not surprising when one considers that Mark 13 contains many apocalyptic elements, including a schedule of events leading up to the end and the use of recognizable apocalyptic language and style.²³⁰ For example, Mark 13:24-25 narrates the darkening of the sun and moon and the falling of the stars in heaven, and in Mark 13:27 the angels are sent to gather the elect from the four winds and “from the ends of the earth to the ends of heaven”. Culpepper writes that “the discourse in Mark 13 is ‘eschatological’ or ‘apocalyptic’ in the sense that it deals with the sign and events that will signal the coming of the Son of Man and the end times”.²³¹

The obvious apocalyptic elements in Mark 13 lead one to suggest that Dan 7-12, the only text belonging to the apocalyptic genre in the Hebrew Bible, is a likely source of inspiration for Mark. The editors of the NA27 text identify five references to Daniel in Mark 13, three of which the UBS4 editors also acknowledges: Dan 12:11/11:31/9:27 in Mark 13:14 (the “abomination of desolations” text), Dan 12:1 in Mark 13:19 (“sufferings such as has not been from the beginning of creation”), and Dan 7:13-14 in Mark 13:26 (“the one like a son of man”). The NA27 also identifies

²²⁹ L. Hartman goes as far as to interpret Mark 13 as a “midrash” on Daniel. L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13 par.* (ConBNT 1; Lund: Gleerup, 1966), 207.

²³⁰ Hooker also observes the absence of many features of apocalyptic writings: no heavenly vision, no use of bizarre imagery, no description of what happens after the parousia, etc. Hooker, *Mark*, 299.

²³¹ Culpepper, *Mark*, 443.

two additional references not acknowledged by the UBS4 text: Dan 2:28-29, 45 in Mark 13:7, and Dan 12:12 in Mark 13:13. Each of these references will be evaluated below.

Mark 13 begins as Jesus and his disciples exit the temple, and he tells them in poetic language that the temple will be destroyed: “Do you see these great buildings? Not one stone will be left here upon another.”²³² They proceed to the Mount of Olives which is opposite the temple (κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ), and Jesus’ disciples ask him when all these things will be accomplished.²³³ Jesus’ response to this question introduces a lengthy discourse concerning this subject. In Mark 13:5-8, Jesus warns them against being led astray by messianic pretenders and informs them that wars, earthquakes, and famines will occur before the end comes. In Mark 13:9-13, he warns them that there will be suffering and persecution on account of him, but that the one who endures to the end will be saved. In Mark 13:14-23, Jesus informs his disciples that persecution in Jerusalem must take place before the appointed time, and that false prophets and messiahs will try to lead them astray. Jesus then combines allusions from three different apocalyptic traditions to explain what the end will look like (Mark 13:24-27). Jesus assures his disciples that what he has described will surely come to pass, yet no one knows when this will happen except for the Father and so they must keep alert (Mark 13:28-37). The figure below gives an overview of the content of the discourse of Mark 13; the text has been subdivided into sections by subject matter.

Figure 10: An Outline of the Subject Matter of the Apocalyptic Discourse.

²³² Mark 13:1.

²³³ Mark 13:3.

Markan Reference	Subject Matter	Content of Discourse
1. Mark 13:1-2	Introduction to Discourse	Pronouncement against the temple, the disciples inquire further.
2. Mark 13:3-8	Warnings: false prophets and impending military conflict.	Warnings against false prophets, and the inevitability of military conflict.
3. Mark 13:9-13	Warning: persecution of disciples.	Disciples will be persecuted on account of Jesus in the synagogue, and in front of rulers. They will be betrayed by their families. However, the Holy Spirit will tell them what to say, and their endurance will lead to their salvation.
4. Mark 13:14-20	Warning: disaster in Jerusalem.	“When the ‘desolating sacrilege’ is set up where it ought not be”, those in Judea must evacuate and flee to the mountains. Urgency is advised, as the suffering in those days will be unparalleled “from the beginning of creation that God created till now...” (Mark 13:19)
5. Mark 13:21-23	Warning: false prophets.	Another warning against false messiahs and prophets who will produce signs and mislead “the elect”. The disciples should not be misled, as Jesus has told them what to expect ahead of time.
6. Mark 13:24-27	The coming of the Son of Man.	Jesus employs the language of Isaiah 13:10 to describe the terrible day of the Lord, and the vision of Daniel 7:13-14 to speak about a time when ‘The Son of Man’ will appear.
7. Mark 13:28-31	Assurance of the above (the coming of the Son of Man <i>after</i> various tribulations.)	Jesus uses the analogy of a blooming fig tree to illustrate that the coming of the Son of Man/Messiah figure will surely come following the events he has described.
8. Mark 13:32-37	Response to the Disciples’	Because no one except the Father, not even the angels in heaven nor the son, know

	initial question, and admonition.	exactly when this will happen, the disciples must keep alert, lest ‘the master of the house’ returns and finds his ‘servants’ sleeping.
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

In Mark 13:4, the disciples ask Jesus “when this will be, and what will be the sign that all these things are about to be accomplished?” It can be seen from the figure above that Jesus’ response to their question contains a series of warnings and finally concludes with the answer “[b]ut about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father”.²³⁴ Because the disciples do not know “when the time will come”, they must be on watch like the servants awaiting the return of their master and keep alert (γρηγορεῖτε). Therefore, the proclamations Jesus makes in Mark 13 should be understood with Mark’s intention to downplay apocalyptic fervour and speculation. C. B. Cousar notes that the apocalyptic language in Mark 13 is “tempered by elements which appear to be antiapocalyptic”.²³⁵ The emphasis of the revelations Jesus makes about the future is that the end will come *after* the events and predicaments he describes. The function of the apocalyptic proclamations is not to reveal future events, but to stress that even when these events happen, the end still has *not yet* arrived. Furthermore, the multiple occurrences of warnings against false messiahs and prophets who claim that the end has come²³⁶ further support this view. As Culpepper and Hooker correctly note, Mark 13 seems to deliberately minimize eschatological expectations and rumours.²³⁷ In addition, the message of Mark 13 is also one of comfort, assuring Mark’s readers

²³⁴ Mark 13:32.

²³⁵ C. B. Cousar, “Eschatology and Mark’s Theologia Crucis: A Critical Analysis of Mark 13,” *Int* 24 (1970): 321.

²³⁶ Mark 13:5-6, 21-22,

²³⁷ Culpepper, *Mark*, 443; Hooker, *Mark*, 299-300.

that the persecution and conflicts they are experiencing are part of the divine plan, and that soon God will act decisively to establish his rule.²³⁸

3.2.4.1. *Mark 13:7 / Dan 2:28-29, 45*

δεῖ γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐπω τὸ τέλος...

3.2.4.1.1 THE MARKAN CONTEXT

The immediate context of the reference to Dan 2:28-29 and 45 is Jesus' warnings against false prophets and impending military conflicts (Mark 13:3-8). Mark writes, "When you hear of wars and rumours of wars, do not be alarmed; this must take place, but the end is still to come".²³⁹ The message is that military conflicts are unavoidable and part of the series of events that must occur before the end. The assumption from the text is that the audience is surprised or fearful concerning "wars and rumours of wars". The phrase "this must take place" (δεῖ γενέσθαι) suggests that military conflicts are part of the divine plan of events before the end. Jesus comforts Mark's readers, telling them not to be alarmed (μὴ θροεῖσθε) because these things must happen. The editors of the NA27 as well as various commentators consider δεῖ γενέσθαι to be a possible reference to Daniel.²⁴⁰

3.2.4.1.2 DANIEL IN MARK

Below is a comparison of Mark 13:7 with the suggested references to Dan 2:28-29 and 45:

Figure 11: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:7 and Dan 2:28-29, 45.

Mark 13:7

²³⁸ See also G. Beasley-Murray, "The Vision on the Mount: The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13," *Ex Auditu* 6 (1990): 45.

²³⁹ Mark 13:7.

²⁴⁰ "This clause may have influenced the discussion of the End in the eschatological discourse of Jesus in Mark and parallels." A.Y. Collins, "Influence", 106.

ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων, μὴ θροεῖσθε· <u>δεῖ γενέσθαι</u> , ἀλλ' οὕτω τὸ τέλος.	
Daniel 2:28-9, 45	
LXX	<p><u>Dan 2:28</u> ἀλλ' ἔστι θεὸς ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀνακαλύπτων²⁴¹ μυστήρια, ὃς ἐδήλωσε τῷ βασιλεῖ Ναβουχοδοноσορ ἃ <u>δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν</u>. βασιλεῦ, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζῇ²⁴². τὸ ἐνύπνιον καὶ τὸ ὄραμα τῆς κεφαλῆς σου ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης σου τοῦτό ἐστι. 29 σύ, βασιλεῦ, κατακλιθεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης σου ἐώρακας πάντα²⁴³, ὅσα <u>δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν</u>, καὶ ὁ ἀνακαλύπτων μυστήρια ἐδήλωσέ σοι ἃ <u>δεῖ γενέσθαι</u>.</p> <p><u>Dan 2:45</u> καθάπερ ἐώρακας ἐξ ὅρους τμηθῆναι λίθον ἄνευ χειρῶν, καὶ συνηλόησε τὸ ὄστρακον, τὸν σίδηρον καὶ τὸν χαλκὸν καὶ τὸν ἄργυρον καὶ τὸν χρυσόν. ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ἐσήμανε τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ ἐσόμενα ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ ἀκριβὲς τὸ ὄραμα, καὶ πιστὴ ἡ τούτου κρίσις.</p>
Θ	<p><u>Dan 2:28</u> ἀλλ' ἡ ἔστιν θεὸς ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀποκαλύπτων μυστήρια καὶ ἐγνώρισεν τῷ βασιλεῖ Ναβουχοδοноσορ ἃ <u>δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν</u>. τὸ ἐνύπνιον σου καὶ αἱ ὁράσεις τῆς κεφαλῆς σου ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης σου τοῦτό ἐστιν. 29 σύ βασιλεῦ, οἱ διαλογισμοί σου ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης σου ἀνέβησαν τί <u>δεῖ γενέσθαι</u> μετὰ ταῦτα, καὶ ὁ ἀποκαλύπτων μυστήρια ἐγνώρισέν σοι ἃ <u>δεῖ γενέσθαι</u>.</p> <p><u>Dan 2:45</u> ὃν τρόπον εἶδες ὅτι ἀπὸ ὅρους ἐτμήθη λίθος ἄνευ χειρῶν καὶ ἐλέπτυνεν τὸ ὄστρακον, τὸν σίδηρον, τὸν χαλκόν, τὸν ἄργυρον, τὸν χρυσόν. ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ἐγνώρισεν τῷ βασιλεῖ ἃ <u>δεῖ γενέσθαι</u> μετὰ ταῦτα, καὶ ἀληθινὸν τὸ ἐνύπνιον, καὶ πιστὴ ἡ σύγκρισις αὐτοῦ.</p>
MT	<p>ברם איתי אלה בשמיא גלא רזין והודע למלכא נבוכדנצר מה די להוא באחרית יומיא חלמך וחזוי ראשך על משכבך דנה הוא פ אנתה אנת מלכא רעיונך על משכבך סלקו מה די להוא אחרי דנה וגלא רזיא הודעך מה די להוא</p> <p>כל קבל די חזית די מטורא אתגזרת</p>

²⁴¹ Ziegler's edition reads φωτίζων. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 250.

²⁴² Ziegler's edition has ζήση. Ibid.

²⁴³ Ziegler omits πάντα. Ibid.

	אבן די לא בידין והדקת פרזלא נחשא חספא כספא ודהבא אלה רב הודע למלכא מה די להוא אחרי דנה ויצוב חלמא ומהימן פשרה פ
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The phrase δει γενέσθαι can be found in Dan 2:28-29 LXX and Dan 2:28-9, 45 Θ, exactly as it appears in Mark 13:7. The Greek phrase in LXX and Θ translates the Aramaic מה די להוא, meaning “what will be”. מה is the interrogative pronoun, די is a relative pronoun, and להוא is the peal imperfect 3rd person masculine singular verb להוה, meaning “to become”. Consequently, the phrase δει γενέσθαι is always accompanied by a pronoun as a subject for the verb γίνομαι: ἃ, ὅσα, and τί. This is a significant element, because in Dan 2 the phrase δει γενέσθαι together with the pronoun simply means “what things will be”. King Nebuchadnezzar receives revelations of “what will be” from Daniel, “the revealer of mysteries” (ὁ ἀνακαλύπτων μυστήρια), as well as “the great God” (ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας).²⁴⁴ Thus, in Daniel, the phrase is associated with the revelation of future events.

However, no pronouns appear in Mark’s use of the phrase and as a result, the phrase on its own takes on a different nuance. The phrase no longer means “these things will be” but rather, “it is necessary [for the wars and rumours of wars] to happen”. Thus, the Danielic emphasis on the revelation of future events is removed. Therefore, Mark 13:7 cannot have arisen from the Aramaic Danielic phrase because Mark’s appropriation of the phrase is dependent on the Greek wording that allows him to alter its meaning for his own context. Consequently, even though Mark’s wording of δει γενέσθαι matches the LXX and texts exactly, Mark is using the

²⁴⁴ Dan 2:28-29, 45 LXX & Θ.

phrase in a different sense than Daniel. In Daniel δεῖ γενέσθαι refers to a revelation of what will be, but in Mark it refers to the necessity of a particular happening.

Other uses of δεῖ γενέσθαι in the New Testament are especially illuminating for understanding Mark's usage. Apart from Matthew and Luke's parallels to Mark 13:7,²⁴⁵ the phrase is found once in Matt 26:54 and thrice in the book of Revelation.²⁴⁶ Revelation's use of δεῖ γενέσθαι is consistent with the manner in which the phrase is used in Daniel. Each use of the phrase in Revelation is preceded by the pronoun ἄ, as in Daniel, and is associated with the theme of revelation. For example, in Rev 4:1, John is to be shown "what will be after these things" (ἀνάβα ὧδε, καὶ δείξω σοι ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα.). The use of the verb δείκνυμι in the book of Revelation refers to the action of heavenly beings revealing things to John, and is consistent with the revelatory use of δεῖ γενέσθαι in Daniel.²⁴⁷

However, δεῖ γενέσθαι is used in a different sense in Matt 26:54. Matt 26:36-56 narrates Jesus' betrayal and arrest in Gethsemane, and when his followers begin to violently resist his capture, Jesus responds by saying that his arrest fulfils scriptures and that his arrest must happen (πῶς οὖν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ ὅτι οὕτως δεῖ γενέσθαι;). The use of δεῖ γενέσθαι in this context does not include a pronoun, and there is also no connection to revelation. The phrase simply means that it is necessary for a particular thing to be, or an event to happen. It is unlikely that Matt 26:54 is referencing Dan 2 because even though the same wording is used, the meaning of the two phrases is very different.

²⁴⁵ Matt 24:6; Luke 21:9.

²⁴⁶ Rev 1:1; 4:1; 22:6.

²⁴⁷ A.Y. Collins also considers Dan 2:28 to be alluded to throughout Revelation. See A. Y. Collins, "Influence", 106.

When compared with these examples, Mark's use of δεῖ γενέσθαι resembles that of Matt 26:54 more than the usage that is found in the book of Revelation where there is no pronoun used and the element of future revelation is absent. In addition, while the content of what δεῖ γενέσθαι in Dan 2 is the mystery of the kingdom of the God of heaven, in Mark 13 the phrase refers to "wars and rumours of war". In conclusion, even though the same phrase appears in both Mark 13 and Dan 2, both the meaning of the phrase and its referent are different. Therefore, it is unlikely for Mark 13:7 to be considered a Danielic reference.

Although δεῖ γενέσθαι is a relatively rare construction in the New Testament, there is one other example of its usage outside of the Danielic context (i.e. Matt 26:54). More likely, δεῖ γενέσθαι is a Markan construction that happens to resemble Dan 2. This conclusion is further supported by observing Mark's independent use of δεῖ and γίνομαι. γίνομαι occurs frequently in Mark (fifty-five occurrences), with seven occurrences in Mark 13 alone. δεῖ occurs six times in Mark, and three of these are found in the discourse of Mark 13. Hence, the use of the two words together without the influence of Daniel should not be seen as unusual.

Although the position of this dissertation is that Mark 13:7 does not contain a reference to Daniel, there are several arguments for why it may contain a reference. The exact phrase δεῖ γενέσθαι—albeit with the accompanying relative pronoun—occurs in Dan 2 (both LXX and Θ) among the texts of the Hebrew Bible. Furthermore, it is a highly concentrated use of the phrase, which occurs a total of three times in the LXX and four times in Θ. The phrase is not found in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha or Josephus, and only appears once in Philo, "θεὸν γενέσθαι δεῖ πρότερον" (2QEx 3). The similar phrase δεῖ εἶναι is a more common

expression and is found in multiple texts in the LXX, the Pseudepigrapha, and in the New Testament.²⁴⁸ For this reason, Daniel is a possible influence for any text that uses this exact phrase. The book of Revelation, as it has been observed above, most likely borrowed the phrase from Daniel. However, very few texts make this particular reference to Daniel, and the Matthean and Lukan occurrences in the Markan parallels are probably preserving Mark's tradition rather than independently alluding to Daniel.

The other argument for Danielic influence in Mark 13:7 is the seeming correspondence between Daniel ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν and τὸ τέλος in Mark. In the context of Dan 2, the complete expression actually consists of three elements: a pronoun (ἃ / ὅσα / τί), δεῖ γενέσθαι, and a phrase about the future (ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν/ μετὰ ταῦτα). The meaning of the expression is that the revelation to Nebuchadnezzar concerns "what will be at the last days" or "what will be after these things". In Mark, τὸ τέλος occurs twice in Mark 13²⁴⁹ to refer to the end of the present age that Jesus is describing. In the following text in Mark 13:13, Jesus states that the one who perseveres to the end will be saved (ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται). In Mark 13:7, the emphasis is that even though the wars and rumours of wars must be, the end has not yet come (δεῖ γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐπω τὸ τέλος).

Therefore, while there is a similarity to the reference of the end and the last days, the intent of the two texts are opposite. Daniel is a revelation of what is to come whereas Mark (at Mark 13:7) emphatically denies that what he has described is

²⁴⁸ 4 Macc 7:8; Wis 12:19; Sir 1:1; Joseph 14:3; Aristas 7, 31, 106, 147, Pseudo-Hecat 3:1; Luke 2:49; Acts 19:36; 1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:7; 1 Pet 1:6, etc.

²⁴⁹ τὸ τέλος only occurs one other time in Mark 3:26, in relation to the end of Satan if he stands up against himself.

the end (τὸ τέλος). A possible explanation is that Mark is using Daniel in an ironic fashion; he employs Danielic language but is actually stating the opposite. However, given that δεῖ γενέσθαι is used as the language of necessity—not the language of future revelation in Mark and the fact that in the very following text (Mark 13:24-27) Jesus proceeds to reveal what will happen in the end, an ironic reference to Dan 2 is very unlikely.

3.2.4.1.3 FUNCTION IN MARK

In the preceding discussion, the conclusion was reached that despite some apparent similarities, Mark 13:7 is not likely to be a reference to Dan 2. If Mark were to make a reference Dan 2, however, the purpose would be to set Jesus' apocalyptic discourse in the revelatory language of Daniel. Especially in light of Dan 2, the phrase ὃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν refers to the content of Nebuchadnezzar's dream: the defeat of the nations and the future inauguration of the kingdom of God. However, even though Jesus' discourse in Mark 13 does contain revelations of various sorts, the use of the phrase in Mark 13:7 pertains to events that must happen but do not signify the end.

3.2.4.2. *Mark 13:13 / Dan 12:12*

ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται...

3.2.4.2.1. THE MARKAN CONTEXT

The setting of this reference is in the section of the discourse in which Jesus warns his disciples of the persecution they will face (Mark 13:9-13). The clause βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς highlights the shift of emphasis from the previous section of warnings against military conflicts (Mark 13:3-8) to matters that directly concern his

disciples.²⁵⁰ Jesus warns his followers that they will be betrayed to councils, beaten in synagogues, and made to stand before governors and kings for his sake (ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ).²⁵¹ They will also be betrayed by their own families, even unto death.²⁵²

However, Jesus offers assurances that although they will be hated on account of his name, those who persevere to the end will be saved (ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται).²⁵³ The word ὑπομένω, according to BDAG, can be defined as “to maintain a belief or course of action in the face of opposition”, and is only found in this verse in Mark.²⁵⁴

While the verb ὑπομένω only occurs seventeen times in the New Testament, the cognate noun ὑπομονή appears thirty-two times, most notably in Romans and Revelation. The theme of perseverance, especially in the face of suffering because of one’s allegiance to Jesus, is a recurring theme in the New Testament.²⁵⁵ Revelation 2:2, in particular, is remarkably similar to Mark 13:13, with ὑπομονη being used in the context of endurance for the sake of Jesus’ name (καὶ ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις καὶ ἐβάστασας διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου καὶ οὐ κεκοπίακες).

The exact Markan phrase ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται appears verbatim in two separate pericopes in Matthew.²⁵⁶ In Matt 10:22, this phrase as well as other elements of Mark 13:9-13 are embedded in Jesus’ instructions to the

²⁵⁰ Many have rightly observed that although the disciples are the recipients of Jesus’ discourse in the narrative, Mark’s actual audience is being addressed. However, this dissertation will not engage in discussions about historical considerations of Mark’s audience. See, Hooker, *Mark*, 310-12; A. Y. Collins, 606-7; A. Y. Collins, “The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13” in *The Four Gospels, FSF*. Neirynck; ed. F. Van Segbroeck, et al. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1132-1137.

²⁵¹ Mark 13:9.

²⁵² Mark 13:12.

²⁵³ Mark 13:13.

²⁵⁴ Definition taken from BDAG, s. v. “ὑπομένω”.

²⁵⁵ Rom 5:3; 12:12; 2 Cor 1:6; 6:4; 2 Thess 1:4; 1 Tim 2:10; 2 Tim 2:12; Heb 12:7; Jas 1:3-4; 1 Pet 2:20; Rev 1:9; 2:2; 13:10; 14:12.

²⁵⁶ Matt 10:22; 24:13.

disciples as he sends them out on their missionary journey. The exact phrase is also found in Matt 24:13, in Matthew's version of the Mark's Olivet Discourse. The Lukan parallel paraphrases Mark, using the cognate noun instead and "obtaining your lives" in place of "being saved" (ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν).

3.2.4.2.2 DANIEL IN MARK

A comparison of the similarities between the Markan and Danielic texts can be observed in the following figure.

Figure 12: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:13 and Dan 12:12.

Mark 13:13	
ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.	
Daniel 12:12	
LXX	μακάριος ὁ ἐμμένων καὶ ²⁵⁷ συνάξει εἰς ἡμέρας χιλίας τριακοσίας τριάκοντα πέντε.
Θ	μακάριος ὁ ὑπομένων καὶ φθάσας εἰς ἡμέρας χιλίας τριακοσίας τριάκοντα πέντε.
MT	אשרי המכה ויגיע לימים אלף שלש מאות שלשים והמשה

The most striking parallel between Mark 13:13 and Dan 12:12 is the use of the substantival participle of ὑπομένω in both Mark and Θ.²⁵⁸ The LXX uses the verb ἐμμένω, which means "to persist in a state or enterprise".²⁵⁹ The Aramaic verb

²⁵⁷ Ziegler's edition has ὅτι instead of καί, denoting the two verbs are not in parallel but the second clause is the cause for the first. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 394.

²⁵⁸ Mark employs the aorist participle and Θ employs the present participle.

²⁵⁹ Definition taken from BDAG, s. v. "ἐμμένω".

behind the Greek translations is **חכה**, meaning “to wait”.²⁶⁰ The use of **ὑπομένω** in Dan 12:12 is slightly different in the LXX and Θ. The LXX follows the MT more closely than Θ in this verse, translating **אשר ימחכה ויגיע** with a participle and a future indicative verb: **μακάριος ὁ ἐμμένων καὶ συνάξει**. The meaning of this phrase should be: “blessed is the one who endures, and he will gather together unto one thousand three hundred and thirty-five years”.²⁶¹ The Θ translation, however translates both verbs as participles, rendering a slightly different meaning: “blessed is the one who endures and who reaches one thousand three hundred and thirty-five years” (**μακάριος ὁ ὑπομένων καὶ φθάσας...**).

In the context of Dan 12, the one who perseveres and reaches one-thousand-three-hundred-and-thirty-five days is described as “blessed” (**μακάριος**). **μακάριος** only occurs once in all of Daniel (LXX or Θ) and in connection to the context of Dan 12, it refers to the blessings one will receive at the time of the end.²⁶² These blessings include resurrection and eternal life (Dan 12:2), the wise will be made to shine like the stars (12:3), and most relevant to Mark 13:13, Daniel’s people will be saved (Θ: **σωθήσεται**).²⁶³ The occurrence of both **ὑπομένω** and **σῶζω** suggests that Mark may have depended on the Θ version of Dan 12. Furthermore, the context of Dan 12, particularly in verse 1, is especially appropriate to Mark’s subject matter in Mark 13:9-13. Dan 12:1 describes a decisive moment for the people of Israel: “At that time Michael, the great prince, the protector of your people, shall arise. There shall be a time of anguish, such as has never occurred since nations first came into existence.

²⁶⁰ Definition taken from BDB, s. v. “**חכה**”.

²⁶¹ Translation mine. The variant reading with **ὅτι** instead of **καὶ** strengthens this relationship further, rendering the meaning “blesed is the one who endures *because* he will gather unto...” Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 394.

²⁶² Dan 12 refers to “the time of the end” or “the end of days” several times, c.f. Rev 12:1, 9, 13.

²⁶³ Rev 12:1. The LXX has “exalted” (**ὑψωθήσεται**) instead of “saved” (**σωθήσεται**).

But at that time your people shall be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book.” The same sequence of distress (θλίψις), followed by salvation (Θ: σῶζω) can also be observed in Mark 13:9-13. Mark 13:9-12 describes the persecution of Jesus’ followers and in 13:13 their salvation “in the end” (εἰς τέλος). If Mark 13:13 is indeed a reference to Dan 12:12, it would suggest that Mark interprets Daniel’s one thousand three hundred and thirty-five days to refer to the time until “the time of the end/ the end of days”,²⁶⁴ when the things Daniel describes will be accomplished. However, as is consistent with Mark’s theme to downplay eschatological fervour in the rest of Mark 13, Daniel’s mysterious calculation of days is replaced by the expression “the end” (εἰς τέλος).

A survey of the LXX’s use of ὑπομένω reveals 82 occurrences of the word, appearing most often in the Psalms (19 occurrences), 4 Maccabees (15 occurrences), and Job (14 occurrences). The occurrences in the Psalms are used to describe the psalmist’s yearning for God as he waits on him. For example, in Ps 25:5 the psalmist writes, “Lead me in your truth, and teach me, for you are the God of my salvation; for you I wait all day long (καὶ σὲ ὑπέμεινα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν)”. The use of ὑπομένω in Job mostly describes the physical act of waiting for another person. For example, in Job 32:4, “Elihu had waited to speak to Job, because they were older [Job’s other companions] than he” (Ελίου δὲ ὑπέμεινεν δοῦναι ἀπόκρισιν Ἰωβ, ὅτι πρεσβύτεροι αὐτοῦ εἰσιν ἡμέραις). However, the use of ὑπομένω in 4 Maccabees, the grisly account of piety under torture, refers to endurance in the midst of suffering. In 4 Macc 6:9, there is a description of “the one who endures pain who despises calamity” (ὁ δὲ ὑπέμενε τοὺς πόνους καὶ περιεφρόνει τῆς ἀνάγκης...).

²⁶⁴ Rev 12:1, 9, 13. Another way Daniel describes the time of the end is with “in that time” (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ). Cf. Dan 12:1

In the context of Dan 2, both meanings “to persevere” and “to wait” are possible. Given that the following verb in Dan 12:12 pertains to “reaching one thousand three hundred and thirty-five days”, the meaning “to wait” is quite appropriate. However, in light of the context of the distress that the nation will face—including the desolating sacrilege mentioned in Dan 12:11, the act of waiting also takes on the connotations of endurance and perseverance.

Finally, there is one LXX text in which ὑπομένω is used in relation to σώζω, Sir 51:8: “Then I remembered your mercy, O Lord, and your kindness of old, for you rescue those who wait for you and save them from the hand of their enemies” (καὶ ἐμνήσθην τοῦ ἐλέους σου, κύριε, καὶ τῆς ἐργασίας σου τῆς ἀπ’ αἰῶνος, ὅτι ἐξαιρῇ τοὺς ὑπομένοντάς σε καὶ σώξεις αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν). However, τοὺς ὑπομένοντάς has a direct object (σε) in this text, referring to God (κύριε) and is therefore closer to the use of ὑπομένω in the Psalms.

Mark 13:13 exhibits lexical as well as conceptual correspondence with Daniel 12:12 Θ (and 12:1) and is likely to be a Danielic reference. A. Y. Collins observes that later Christian readers understood Daniel’s one-thousand-three-hundred-and-thirty-five days as the end of days, and for this reason Collins believes that Mark 13:13 is an adaptation of Dan 12:12.²⁶⁵ However, neither Matthew nor Luke, both of whom appropriate this particular Markan text in their gospels, appear to recognize the Danielic reference in their own writings. They do not identify the allusion nor redact Mark’s reference to conform more closely to the Danielic text. Luke simply

²⁶⁵ A. Y. Collins, “Influence”, 111.

paraphrases Mark, and Matthew even reproduces Mark's unusual grammatical structure of the phrase verbatim: ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.²⁶⁶

3.2.4.1.3 FUNCTION IN MARK

The content of Mark 13:9-13 is the persecution of the disciples, and verse 13 is a word of encouragement and exhortation. The literary function of the reference to Daniel in Mark 13:13 is to locate the struggles of the suffering disciples in the cosmic and eschatological struggle of Israel as narrated in Dan 12. The reference to Daniel allows Mark's audience to identify with the great distress of God's people, to find courage to endure through the various hardships foretold by Jesus in Mark 13, and to put their hope in their coming salvation in the end of days. Through this allusion, Mark assimilates the eschatological conflict for his audience and encourages them with the hope and eventual victory envisioned by Daniel.

3.2.4.3. *Mark 13:14 / Dan 12:11 / 11:31 / 9:27*

Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ...

3.2.4.3.1. THE MARKAN CONTEXT

In the following section, Mark 13:14-19, the focus shifts again, this time from the disciples to turmoil in Judea. The fact that the pronouncements in this section target Judea is signalled by the detail given in Mark 13:14b, "those in Judea" are advised to escape to the mountains (οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη). There will be heightened sense of urgency as even those who are in the field "should not turn back to get a coat" and it will be disastrous for those who are pregnant and nursing

²⁶⁶ Mark 13:13; Matt 10:22; 24:13.

children.²⁶⁷ The suffering in those days (αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι) will be extreme; it is described as suffering that “has not been from the beginning of the creation that God created until now, no, and never will be”.²⁶⁸

The catalyst for these troubles is given at the beginning of the section, in Mark 13:14: “[W]hen you see the desolating sacrilege²⁶⁹ set up where it not to be (let the reader understand)”. Both the NA27 and UBS4 texts identify the expression ‘desolating sacrilege’ as an allusion to Daniel. The likelihood that Mark 13:14 contains a reference to Daniel is very strong, because the Matthean parallel of this text identifies it as such and explicitly mentions Daniel by name: “So when you see the desolating sacrilege standing in the holy place, as was spoken of by the prophet Daniel...”²⁷⁰ Because the phrase only appears in literature that appears after Daniel, ‘desolating sacrilege’ likely originated in Daniel.

The phrase is also seen in later texts such as 1 Macc 1:54, pesher from Qumran (1QpHab 12.7-9), and Josephus (*Ant.* 10.37-38). The Qumran passage interprets Habakkuk, which is a denouncement of violence, bloodshed, and the perversion of justice that looks forward to a revival of God’s works of wonder and renown. Josephus’ account indicates that the abomination was the shedding of priestly blood in the sanctuary, which culminated in the destruction of the temple with the erection of Roman standards and images of emperors on the site of the temple.

Luke’s parallel of the Markan text in Luke 21:20, in which he replaces “sacrilege” with “armies encircling Jerusalem”, agrees with this reading of Josephus.

²⁶⁷ Mark 13:15-8.

²⁶⁸ Mark 13:19.

²⁶⁹ Hereafter, the term “desolating sacrilege” will be used to refer to the various forms of τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως that follow.

²⁷⁰ Matt 24:15.

Luke writes, “When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near”.²⁷¹ The element of desolation is still present, but the “sacrilege” has been interpreted to refer to the Roman armies. The NA27 and UBS4 suggest three possible Danielic references for Mark 13:14: Dan 12:11, 11:31, and 9:27. The relationship between Mark 13:14 and these texts will be explored in greater detail in the following discussion.

3.2.4.3.2 DANIEL IN MARK

The following figure highlights the similarities between Mark 13:14 and the various versions of Dan 12:11, 11:31, and 9:27.

Figure 13: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:14 and Dan 12:11/11:31/9:27.

Mark 13:14	
<p>Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη...</p>	
Daniel 12:11/11:31/9:27	
LXX	<p>ἀφ' οὗ ἂν ἀποσταθῇ ἡ θυσία διὰ παντός καὶ ἐτοιμασθῇ δοθῆναι τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐνενήκοντα.</p> <p>καὶ βραχίονες παρ' αὐτοῦ στήσονται καὶ μianoῦσι τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ φόβου καὶ ἀποστήσουσι τὴν θυσίαν καὶ δώσουσι βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως.</p> <p>...καὶ ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς ἐβδομάδος ἀρθήσεται ἡ θυσία καὶ ἡ σπονδή, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων ἔσται ἕως συντελείας²⁷², καὶ συντέλεια δοθήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρήμωσιν.</p>
Θ	<p>καὶ ἀπὸ καιροῦ παραλλάξεως τοῦ ἐνδελεχισμοῦ καὶ τοῦ δοθῆναι²⁷³ βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως²⁷⁴ ἡμέραι χίλια διακόσια ἐνενήκοντα.</p>

²⁷¹ Luke 21:20.

²⁷² Ziegler inserts καιροῦ. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 368.

²⁷³ Ziegler's edition has the future passive indicative δοθήσεται. Ibid., 395.

	<p>καὶ σπέρματα ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀναστήσονται καὶ βεβηλώσουσιν τὸ ἅγιασμα τῆς δυναστείας καὶ μεταστήσουσιν τὸν ἐνδελειχισμόν καὶ δώσουσιν βδέλυγμα ἠφανισμένον²⁷⁵.</p> <p>καὶ δυναμώσει διαθήκην πολλοῖς, ἑβδομάς μία· καὶ ἐν τῷ ἡμίσει τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἀρθήσεταιί μου²⁷⁶ θυσία καὶ σπονδή, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων, καὶ ἕως συντελείας καιροῦ συντέλεια δοθήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρήμωσιν.</p>
MT	<p>ומעת הוסר התמיד ולתת שקוץ שמם ימים לף מאתים ותשעים</p> <p>וורעים ממנו יעמדו וחללו המקדש המעוון והסירו התמיד ונתנו וין משומם</p> <p>והגביר ברית לרבים שבוע אחד וחצי השבוע ישבית זבח ומנחה ועל בקר שקוצים משמם ועד כלה ונחרצה תתך על שמם</p>

The desolating sacrilege in the three Danielic accounts refers to the same event: Antiochus IV's placement of an unspeakable abomination in place of the regular burnt offerings in the Jerusalem temple. A. Y. Collins believes that the expression refers to "an altar dedicated to a Greco-Syrian god."²⁷⁷ This view is supported by textual evidence. Each occurrence of the expression 'desolating sacrilege' is also accompanied with the mention of the cessation of regular burnt

²⁷⁴ Ziegler's edition gives many textual variants that include the definite article for βδέλυγμα or ἐρήμωσις, and three variants (A, II 46) that employ definite definite articles, as per the LXX.

²⁷⁵ One variant follows the LXX instead and has ἐρήμωσις (541). Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 385.

²⁷⁶ Ziegler omits μου. Ibid., 367.

²⁷⁷ A. Y. Collins, "Influence", 109. See also, J. J. Collins' discussion in J. J. Collins, *Daniel*, 357-8.

offering (παράλλαξεως τοῦ ἐνδελεχισμοῦ)²⁷⁸ In Daniel 9:20-27, the angel Gabriel reveals the events surrounding the destruction of Jerusalem to Daniel—including the prohibition of the temple sacrifice and the placing of the desolating sacrilege. In a separate vision occurring in Dan 10:1-11:45, the same event is relayed to Daniel when he is given a fuller account of what will happen to his people in the last days (ὑποδείξαι σοι τί ὑπαντήσεται τῷ λαῷ σου ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν). At the very end of Daniel (Dan 12:11) a designation is given for the period “[f]rom the time that the regular burnt offering is taken away and the abomination that desolates is set up”, which is a time period of one-thousand-two-hundred-and-ninety-days. The ‘desolating sacrilege’ refers to the same thing—a devastating disaster to befall the Jewish people that occurs in the temple and is related to the sacrificial system—in Dan 9:27, 11:31, and 12:11.

Although there is agreement as to the meaning of the expression, the lexical form of the phrase varies considerably across different versions of Daniel and even within the same version. On lexical grounds, τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως in Mark 13:14 most resembles the similarly articular expression in Dan 12:11 LXX. However, there are also variants of Θ that also share this reading.²⁷⁹ The completely anarthrous form, βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως, appears in Dan 12:11 Θ and 11:31 LXX, while the partly articular form, βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων, can be found in both LXX and Θ versions of Dan 9:27. The Θ expression at Dan 11:31 does not contain the word ἐρήμωσις at all, instead translating the Hebrew מַשְׁחָה with the passive participle ἡφανισμένον, from the word ἀφανίζω, which means “to conceal or to disfigure”. It should also be noted that the Hebrew expression is only articular in Dan

²⁷⁸ Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11.

²⁷⁹ See footnote 274

11:31 MT (השקין משומם), and furthermore every occurrence of the expression is in the participial form of שם. It appears in the Qal stem in Dan 12:11 and the po'el stem (the intensive stem) in Dan 11:31 and 9:27. In Mark 13:14, the verb used in connection with the desolating sacrilege is perfect active participle of ἵστημι which translates as the sacrilege “has been placed” where it ought not to be in contrast to the verb used in the LXX and Θ is δίδωμι.

The Markan designation, the desolating sacrilege being placed “where it ought not to be” (ὅπου οὐ δεῖ) is a spatial reference. The only occurrence of the desolating sacrilege in Daniel that includes a spatial reference is Dan 9:27—where it specifically mentions that the desolating sacrilege is “on the holy thing” (ἐπὶ τὸ Ἱερόν), which is most likely referring to the altar at the temple.²⁸⁰ However, as discussed above, each description of the desolating sacrilege in Daniel refers to the same event and hence the detail regarding the sacrilege in the temple (ἐπὶ τὸ Ἱερόν) should be understood to be assumed by Daniel’s readers even in the texts where it is not explicitly mentioned. After all, the deplorable nature of the scandal is precisely due to the fact that the desecration took place in the holy temple. Therefore, though the actual form of the Markan allusion is taken from Dan 12:11 LXX, the fuller context of the expression derives from Dan 9:27 and 11:31.

3.2.4.3.3 FUNCTION IN MARK

The literary function of the reference to Daniel’s desolating sacrilege is to articulate the impending calamity in Judea through the apocalyptic lens of Daniel’s prophecies.

In the same way that the disciples’ persecution is portrayed in the eschatological

²⁸⁰ This is likely confirmed by 1 Macc 1:54, the earliest interpretation of this Danielic phrase. “...they erected a desolating sacrilege upon the altar of burnt offering.” See J. J. Collins, *Daniel*, p. 357. The Matthean parallel in Matt 24:15 adds “in the holy place” (ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ) to Mark’s text.

framework of Dan 12, the trouble in Jerusalem is also depicted in this light. In fact, given the proximity of this text to the other reference to Dan 12:12 in Mark 13:13, it is probable that the entire chapter of Dan 12—with its prophetic overtones and eschatological trajectory—played a significant role in the composition of Jesus’ apocalyptic discourse in Mark 13. After all, Matthew, who recognized this text as a Danielic reference, considers Daniel to be a prophet (διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου).²⁸¹ It is also likely that Mark understood Daniel and his writings to be prophetically relevant to his audience’s situation. A. Y. Collins notes that the expression was “borrowed from an older prophecy of the end time to interpret a new situation”, namely “some person, object, or event connected with the Jewish War of 66-72 C.E.”²⁸² The desolating sacrilege in Daniel refers to a terrible catastrophe that will precede the divine intervention of God. Mark employs this very image to convey the eschatological significance of the events unfolding before his own audience.

3.2.4.4. Mark 13:19 / Dan 12:1

ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίψεις οἷα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως...

3.2.4.4.1. THE MARKAN CONTEXT

The reference to Dan 12:1 is found in the section pertaining to warnings about calamity (Mark 13:14-19) that have already been discussed above and will not be repeated here. Instead, a brief introduction of the Danielic context of the reference will be given. Daniel 12:1 describes two events that follow from the arising of Michael, “the great prince”. First, there will be an unprecedented time of trouble

²⁸¹ Matt 24:15.

²⁸² A. Y. Collins, “Influence”, 110.

(καιρὸς θλίψεως[Θ]) that has never been observed since the formation of the nation.²⁸³ Secondly, however, at that time the Jewish people will also be saved (σωθήσεται), according to Θ (MT: will be delivered [niph'al of מלם]; LXX: will be exalted [ύψωθήσεται]).²⁸⁴ The phrase used to depict the time of calamity is considered by both the NA27 and UBS4 to be alluded to in Mark 13:19.

3.2.4.4.2 DANIEL IN MARK

What is the extent of the similarity between Mark 13:19 and Dan 12:1? The figure below offers a comparison of the relevant texts.

Figure 14: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:19 and Dan 12:1.

Mark 13:19	
ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἣν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται.	
Daniel 12:1	
LXX	...ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα θλίψεως, οἷα οὐκ ἐγενήθη ἀφ' οὗ ἐγενήθησαν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης.
Θ	καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ...καὶ ἔσται καιρὸς θλίψεως, θλίψις ²⁸⁵ οἷα οὐ γέγονεν ἀφ' οὗ γεγένηται ἔθνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ ἐκείνου.
MT	וְהָיְתָה עַתְּצָרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא נִהְיְתָה מִדְּיוֹת גּוֹי עַד הָעַתָּה אֲהִיָּה

Many similarities can be observed between Mark and MT, LXX, and Θ

Daniel. Most notable is the similarity in the structure of the sentence which consists

²⁸³ C.f. Exod 9:24. For this particular interpretation of מְהִיָּת גּוֹי, see Collins' discussion in J. J. Collins, *Daniel*, p. 391

²⁸⁴ Dan 12:1.

²⁸⁵ Ziegler omits θλίψις. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 391.

of four elements: the phrases those days (Mark) / that day (LXX) /that time (Θ), the expression “tribulation”, the phrase “such as has not been”, and the designation that such a tribulation has never occurred from a certain time until the present. From a grammatical and lexical perspective, Mark 13:19 most resembles Θ Daniel. Both texts include the third-person future indicative verb of εἰμί, the exact wording of the phrase θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέγονεν, as well as designation of a period of time with the formula ἀπο... ἕως... The lexical and structural similarities between Mark and Θ Daniel are so striking that literary dependence must be assumed.

The major difference between the two texts is that Θ Daniel uses ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ/ καιρὸς θλίψεως, whereas Mark employs αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι (the term used by the LXX). There are two explanations for this difference. First, Mark does not follow Daniel’s use of καιρός to refer to the eschatological expression “in that time” (סִגְרָא דְּעֵינָא), because his own preference in Mark 13 is to use ἡμέραι ἐκείναι, as can be seen in two other texts.²⁸⁶ For example, Mark 13:24 writes, “But in those days, after that suffering, the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light...” And in Mark 13:32 he writes, “But about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father”. With the exception of Mark 13:32, καιρός in Mark does not have eschatological connotations.²⁸⁷

Secondly, a closer examination of the grammatical structure of the two texts reveals that Mark’s Danielic reference most likely begins at “...θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέγονεν”. The grammar of Θ Daniel follows the MT very closely in Dan 12:1, as can be seen below.

²⁸⁶ Mark 13:17, 19, 24, 32. καιρός is used in Mark 13:32 in relation to the eschatological end, but ἡμέραι ἐκείναι is the predominant expression.

²⁸⁷ Mark 1:15; 10:30; 11:13; 12:2.

Figure 15: A Comparison of the Grammar of MT and Θ at Dan 12:1.

	MT Daniel 12:1	Θ Daniel 12:1
1.	ובעת ההיא	καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ
2.	יעמד מיכאל השר הגדול	ἀναστήσεται Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχων ὁ μέγας
3.	העמד על בני עמך	ὁ ἐσθηκὼς ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ λαοῦ σου·
4.	והיתה עת צרה	καὶ ἔσται καιρὸς θλίψεως
5.	אשר לא נהיתה	θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέγονεν
6.	מהיות גוי עד העת ההיא	ἀφ' οὗ γεγένηται ἔθνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ ἐκείνου·
7.	ובעת ההיא	καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ
8.	ימלט עמך	σωθήσεται ὁ λαός σου
9.	כל הנמצא כתוב בספר	πᾶς ὁ εὐρεθεὶς γεγραμμένος ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ.

In section five in the figure above, it can be seen that θλίψις οἷα is an attempt by Θ to translate the Hebrew particle of relation, אשר. καὶ ἔσται in section four of the figure above refers back to ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ in section one. The logic of the sentence should be understood as follows: “At that time Michael will arise...and [that time] will be a time of tribulation, tribulation that has not been...”

The first section of Mark 13:19, ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι, is not actually a reference to the beginning of Dan 12:1, but to the days of the Judean calamity described in Mark 13:14-18. In particular, Mark 13:17 specifically describes “those days” saying, “Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are

nursing infants *in those days*” (ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις)!²⁸⁸ ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι in Mark 13:19 is Mark’s continuation of this theme where he elaborates on the calamitous nature of the days of persecution in Judea with the eschatological language of Dan 12:1.

Therefore, even though there is a lexical overlap between the two third-person future indicative verbs of εἰμί in Mark 13:19 and Dan 12:1 and a conceptual similarity between Mark’s ἡμέραι and Daniel’s καιρός, these elements are merely coincidental. Mark’s reference to Dan 12:1 only begins with θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέγονεν, and is taken from the Θ version.²⁸⁹ The concept of a unique time of distress also appears in Joel 2:2, 1 Macc 9:27, and *T. Moses* 8:1, however, none of these texts display a level of lexical or conceptual compatibility even close to Daniel’s compatibility with Mark. It must be concluded that Mark 13:19 is certainly a reference to Dan 12:1.

3.2.4.4.3. FUNCTION IN MARK

In Mark 13:24-19, the Markan Jesus elaborates on the disastrous calamity that is to befall Judea. The summary statement of this section employs a reference to Dan 12:1, which is an angelic revelation of the eschatological end of days. The reference is made to Daniel’s poetic elaboration of the final and ultimate conflict for the Jewish people before their eventual deliverance. Daniel warns of trouble (θλίψις) the likes of which have never been seen before since the founding of their nation. Mark’s understanding of eschatology is not only demonstrated in this reference to Dan 12:1 in Mark 13:19, but in fact his entire understanding of the eschatological schema is

²⁸⁸ Mark 13:17 (NRSV), emphasis mine.

²⁸⁹ A. Y. Collins asserts that the Markan text is actually closer to the LXX than Θ, but she does not elaborate any further. A. Y. Collins, “Influence”, 110.

influenced by Dan 12. Mark understands the last days to unfold as the Danielic vision foretells, namely that the Jews will experience a great disaster before their final vindication and salvation. This can be seen in Mark 13:24-26 where Jesus explicitly mentions that the end will occur “in those days, after that suffering” (ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν). Mark applies Daniel’s prophetic vision and eschatological framework to the situation of his own audience.

L. Hartman, in a study of eschatology in Jewish apocalyptic texts, suggests five stages or elements that are found in many writings concerning Jewish eschatology: a preliminary time of evil, divine intervention, judgment, the fate of sinners, and the joy of the elect.²⁹⁰ A. Y. Collins demonstrates that the book of Revelation has a three-part eschatological scenario involving persecution, judgment of the persecutors, and salvation of the faithful.²⁹¹ The Markan apocalypse has no hint of Hartman’s judgment stage or Collins’ judgment of the persecutors element even though these can be found in Dan 12. In Daniel 12:2, some of those who awake from “the sleep of the dust of the earth” will face “shame and everlasting contempt”. This illustrates that Mark does depend on Daniel’s eschatological framework. However, he does not mention every element in Daniel’s framework.

Although Mark adopts Daniel’s language and eschatological framework, he also modifies it. Mark’s alterations to the Danielic text further intensify what was already a sensational description of distress. In Dan 12:1, the calamity is described as the most severe that the nation has ever endured up to that moment (ὁ πό οὐ γεγένηται ἔθνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Mark further increases the severity of the suffering,

²⁹⁰ L. Hartman, *Prophecy*, 23-49.

²⁹¹ A. Collins, *Mark*, 615. See also, A. Y. Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation* (HDR 9; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press/ Harvard Theological Review, 1976, reprinted Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2001).

saying that there has not been such a calamity “from the beginning of creation” (ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως) to that time, and that neither will there ever be such a calamity again (καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται). Mark not only applies the wording and the eschatological framework of Daniel’s vision to his own setting, he also interprets that vision anew by modifying the Danielic reference to make it relevant to what he perceives to be the greatest challenge faced by his contemporaries.

3.2.4.5. *Mark 13:26 / Dan 7:13-14*

καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης...

3.2.4.5.1 THE MARKAN CONTEXT

The context of this allusion to Dan 7:13, which both the NA27 and UBS4 texts as well as most interpreters acknowledge,²⁹² is found in the section in Mark 13:24-27 which describes the coming of the Son of Man. This climactic moment, namely, the arrival of the Son of Man, is foreshadowed in several ways throughout the Olivet Discourse. In Mark 13:6, Jesus warns against those who will come in his name.

In Mark 13:21 the warning is against those who claim the arrival of the messiah: “And if anyone says to you at that time, ‘Look! Here is the Messiah!’ or ‘Look! There he is!’—do not believe it.” In the context of these warnings against false prophets and messiahs, the description of the coming and the activity of the Son of Man in Mark 13:24-27 should be understood as the coming and activity of Jesus as the Messiah. In line with this understanding, A. Y. Collins contends that the Son of God sayings in Mark “develop the presentation of Jesus as Son of God and

²⁹² Hooker, *Mark*, 319; A. Y. Collins, *Mark*, 615; Culpepper, *Mark*, 466.

Messiah.”²⁹³ She further suggests that the eschatological discourse in Mark 13 elaborates on the revelation of Mark 8:31 and 38.²⁹⁴

In Mark 8:38, Mark also declares that the Son of Man will come “in the glory of his Father with the holy angels” (ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων). The reference to Dan 7 is the second of three apocalyptic elements found in Mark 13:24-27 as is shown in the following figure.

Figure 16: The Threefold Apocalyptic Elements of Mark 13:24-27.

	Content	References to OT Texts	Apocalyptic Stage
1 st Apocalyptic Element (Mark 13:24-25)	“...the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will be falling from heaven.”	Isa 31:10, 34:4	Judgment
2 nd Apocalyptic Element (Mark 13:26)	“Then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory.”	Dan 7:13	Divine Intervention
3 rd Apocalyptic Element (Mark 13:27)	“Then he will send out the angels, and gather his elect from the four winds...”	Various (possibly including Isa 11:11; 43:6; Zech 2:6, Deut 13:7; 30:4)	Deliverance of God’s people

Mark’s eschatological picture also includes a reference to a composite of Isa 13:10 and 34:4,²⁹⁵ as well as a prominent restoration motif that was already present in various Old Testament prophetic texts and early Jewish literature.²⁹⁶ According to Steve Moyise, fusing together texts from different scriptures is a common practise

²⁹³ A. Y. Collins, “Influence”, 97.

²⁹⁴ Ibid., 98.

²⁹⁵ Hooker, *Mark*, 318.

²⁹⁶ As seen in texts like Ezek 37:21; Mic 2:12; Nah 3:18; 2 Macc 1:27, 2:18; *Naphtali* 8:3, *Ps Sol* 17:26, etc. The theme of gathering the elect: Isa 11:11; 43:6.

“to give a powerful and evocative warnings of future judgment.”²⁹⁷ The function of the reference to the Danielic vision must be understood in the context of this composite of allusions that highlight the different elements in Mark’s eschatological drama. Collins refers to this as “the actualization of scriptural prophecy and eschatological tradition”.²⁹⁸

Isaiah 13:10 and 34:4 associate the Markan apocalypse with the judgment of the nations, and Dan 7 provides the language and details of the decisive moment of divine intervention. Thereafter, the Son of Man (on behalf of God?) will gather the elect from the four corners of the earth. This act of gathering the elect evokes the theme of God gathering the remnant of his people scattered to the “four winds” and bringing them back to Israel.²⁹⁹ Hence, the apocalyptic imagery of the eschatological drama of Mark 13:24-27 is illustrated using a composite of apocalyptic traditions already present in early Judaism.

3.2.4.5.2. DANIEL IN MARK

For most commentators, it is assumed that ὁψονταὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις in Mark 13:26 is a clear allusion to Dan 7:13. There are three primary reasons for this assumption, the uniqueness of the expression to Daniel, Matthew’s identification of the expression in Matt 24:30, and the occurrence of the fuller allusion in Mark 14:62.

The combination of the verb ἐρχομαι with an instrumental use of νεφέλη is unique to Dan 7 in the corpus of the Hebrew Bible. The combination of these two

²⁹⁷ Steve Moyise, *Jesus and Scripture. Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2011), 25.

²⁹⁸ A. Y. Collins, “The Apocalyptic Rhetoric of Mark 13 in Historical Context,” *Biblical Research* 41 (1996): 36.

²⁹⁹ Hooker, *Mark*, 219.

words only appears once in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha book of Esdras. In Esdr 5:7, Ezra receives a revelatory experience in which he is whisked away to heaven on a cloud to witness the judgments taking place there: καὶ ἐν τῷ λέγειν με ταῦτα ἦλθεν νεφέλη καὶ ἥρπασέν με καὶ ἀπήνεγκέν με πάλιν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς. The cloud is the subject of the sentence and Ezra is the object of the sentence, being taken away (ἥρπασέν) by the cloud. In Esdr 5:7, the cloud comes and takes Ezra into heaven. In Daniel, it is the “one like a son of man” who comes, with the clouds of heaven. Prior to Dan 7, there is simply no textual precedent for any figure arriving on clouds, apart from the figure in 4 Ezra 13:3-4 which is a late text composed at the end of the first century. Moreover, it is likely that the account in 4 Ezra is also taken from Dan 7. While the combination of “coming” and “cloud” only appears in Daniel 7:13, among Hebrew Bible texts it appears six times in the New Testament corpus, each text appearing to make reference to the vision of Dan 7.³⁰⁰

Secondly, the Matthean parallel follows Mark 13:26 closely, repeating all four elements of the Markan version. These elements are: 1) καὶ τότε ὄψονται, 2) τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 3) ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις, and 4) μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης. A comparison of Mark 13:26 and Matt 24:30 can be seen in the following figure.

Figure 17: A Comparison of the Parallels of Mark 13:26 and Matt 24:30.

Mark 13:26	Matt 24:30
καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.	καὶ τότε ... καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.

³⁰⁰ Matt 24:30, 26:64; Mark 13:26, 14:62, Luke 21:27; Rev 1:7. Cf. Rev 14:15.

The Markan elements of καὶ τότε ὄψονται, the articular “The Son of Man”, as well as μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης, are Markan innovations not present in Dan 7:13-14. The fact that these same elements are found in the Matthean parallel, and not any other identifiable source-text, means that Matthew is likely to be depending on Mark’s account. In fact, Matthew follows Mark’s wording almost exactly apart from two important exceptions. First, it can be seen that Matthew inserts ‘τοῦ οὐρανοῦ’ after ‘ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν’, a detail which is missing in Mark’s version. In Dan 7:13 the element of ‘τοῦ οὐρανοῦ’ is present in both the Greek and Aramaic versions. Mark omits ‘τοῦ οὐρανοῦ’ when quoting Daniel but Matthew, who is following Mark’s text up to this point, inserts ‘τοῦ οὐρανοῦ’ back into his own text. This unique addition in Matthew (it is not found in the Lukan parallel)³⁰¹ demonstrates that he recognizes Mark’s reference to Dan 7:13 and supplies the omitted Danielic modifier “of heaven”.

Matthew’s redaction is consistent with his tendency to recognize and emphasize Mark’s allusions to scripture. In the previous discussion of Mark 13:14, it was seen that Matthew recognizes Mark’s Danielic allusion to the desolating sacrilege and explicitly attributes the expression to Daniel. Matthew identifies τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως as having been spoken “διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου”.³⁰² In other words, Matthew recognizes Mark’s allusions and makes these references even more explicit. In the Olivet Discourse, Matthew inserts a Danielic element that has been omitted by Mark. Assuming that Matthew is relying on Mark and not writing independently, his insertion of ‘τοῦ οὐρανοῦ’ is significant

³⁰¹ Luke 21:27.

³⁰² Matt 24:15.

and compelling evidence that he recognizes Mark's reference and modifies it so as to make the allusion more explicit.

The second important difference between Matt 24:30 and Mark's reference to Daniel is the preposition employed with the νεφέλη. In Mark 13:26, the Son of Man is described as coming "with/by [instrumental use of ἐν] clouds" (ἐν νεφέλαις). Matthew modifies Mark's preposition phrase with "on the clouds of heaven" (ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). The change appears to be a minor one, but a comparison with the Danielic texts reveal that Matthew's wording is identical to that of Dan 7:13 LXX (ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). Matthew's modification of Mark's preposition is actually highly significant because it not only demonstrates his recognition of the Danielic reference but also his dependence on the LXX text of Daniel. Therefore, it can be seen that these two particular Matthean redactions serve to emphasize the Danielic reference in Mark.

Thirdly, Mark 14:62 also employs the same allusion to Dan 7:13. When Jesus is being questioned by the high priest, Mark alludes to the same vision of the "one like a son of man" from Dan 7: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. This allusion to Daniel differs from the one in Mark 13:26 in that it is a more explicit allusion. Like the Matthean parallel to Mark 13:26, this reference includes the Danielic modifier "of heaven" (τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), thus considerably strengthening the allusion. However, the preposition used is not ἐν νεφέλαις as in Mark 13:26 or even ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ as in Matt 24:30, but μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, the exact wording of Dan 7:13 Θ. Accordingly, the fuller allusion to Daniel in Mark 14:62 supports the notion that the

use of ἐρχόμενον with ἐν νεφέλαις in Mark 13:26 is also an allusion to the same vision.

The three points discussed above are compelling arguments for Mark 13:26's literary dependence on Dan 7:13, but what is the nature and extent of this dependence? The following figure is a comparison of Mark with the different versions of Daniel.

Figure 18: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 13:26 and Dan 7:13-14.

Mark 13:26	
καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.	
Daniel 7:13-14	
LXX	ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ ³⁰³ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο ³⁰⁴ , καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρῆσαν αὐτῷ. 14 καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ³⁰⁵ , καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῷ λατρεύουσα· καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἄρθῃ, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ, ἥτις οὐ μὴ φθαρῇ.
Θ	ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος ἦν ³⁰⁶ καὶ ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐφθασεν καὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ³⁰⁷ προσηνέχθη. 14 καὶ αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ πάντες οἱ λαοί, φυλαί, γλώσσαι αὐτῷ δουλεύουσιν· ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ παρελεύσεται, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ οὐ διαφθαρῆσεται.
MT	חזת הוית בחזוי ליליא וארו עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוה ועד עתיק יומיא מטא וקדמוהי הקרבוהי 14 ולה יהיב שלטן ויקר ומלכו וכל עממא אמיא ולשניא לה יפלחון

³⁰³ Some variants read μετὰ. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 338.

³⁰⁴ Ziegler places ἦρχετο before ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου. Ibid.

³⁰⁵ Ziegler's edition inserts the adjective βασιλικός, meaning "royal". Definition taken from BDAG, c. v. "βασιλικός, ἡ, ὄν".

³⁰⁶ Ziegler omits ἦν. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 339.

³⁰⁷ Instead of ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, Ziegler's text reads αὐτῷ. Ibid.

	שלטנה שלטן עלם די לא יעדה ומלכותה די לא תתחבל פ
--	----------------------------------------------------

As can be observed from the figure above, there are both similarities and differences between Mark 13:26 and the Danielic texts. Similarities include the use of a word for “seeing”: ὁράω in Mark and θεωρέω in LXX and Θ. However, it should be noted that θεωρέω in the Greek versions of Daniel specifically refers to Daniel’s vision of the night (ὁράματι τῆς νυκτός), whereas Mark’s “seeing” refers to those who see Jesus’ return at the end of days. In addition, there is a lexical similarity between Daniel’s “one like a son of man” (ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου) and Mark’s use of the articular Son of Man (τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου).

The addition of the definite article is a Markan editorial insertion, linking the Danielic “one like a son of man” with Jesus, for whom the Son of Man is an exclusive self-referential title in Mark.³⁰⁸ Mogens Müller writes, “Whatever its meaning was in Aramaic, the Greek, if not a title, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου seemed to function as an unambiguous reference to Jesus.”³⁰⁹ He also notes that “the use of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, with two definite articles is unknown outside the New Testament and literature dependent on it.”³¹⁰ A.Y. Collins suggests that the definite form of the expression was used by Jesus “in order to point to the text already known to his audience.”³¹¹

There is also a mention of “clouds” (νεφέλαί) in both texts, although as already mentioned in the previous section, the Markan preposition ἐν does not

³⁰⁸ Mark 2:10; 2:28; 8:31, 38; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33, 45; 13:26; 14:21, 41, 62. See M. Müller, *The Expression ‘Son of Man’ and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation* (London; Oakville: Equinox Publishing, 2008), 375, 418.

³⁰⁹ Müller, *Son of Man*, 392.

³¹⁰ Ibid., 2.

³¹¹ A. Y. Collins, “Influence”, 105. Collins contends that Jesus’ followers identified him with the heavenly figure of Dan 7:13 after his death.

correspond to any of the Danielic prepositions (LXX: ἐπὶ, Θ: μετὰ, MT: אַחֲרֵי). All three texts also have the verb ἔρχομαι, but they are grammatically different from each other. In the LXX ἔρχομαι is an imperfect indicative verb and should be translated: “I was seeing in a vision of the night, and behold, on the clouds of heaven one like a son of man was coming...” In Θ, ἔρχομαι is a periphrastic participle used in conjunction with the imperfect form of εἰμί. The finite verb usually precedes the periphrastic participle, but Boyer has demonstrated twenty-eight instances when the participle precedes the verb, as is the case in Dan 7:13 Θ.³¹² The present form of the participle ἐρχόμενος, with the imperfect finite verb ἦν is simply another way to express the imperfect tense.³¹³

The text of Θ is a literal translation of the Aramaic, which includes both terms, one for “coming” and one for “to be”: ܕܢܝܢ ܕܥܡܪܐ. Therefore Dan 7:13 Θ should be translated: “I was seeing in a vision of the night and behold, with the clouds of heaven one like a son of man was coming...” The use of ἔρχομαι in Mark 13:26, however, is a participle (ἐρχόμενον) that describes the action that is perceived by the subjects of the verb ὁψονταί. Mark 13:26 should be translated as: “and then they will see the Son of Man coming by [in?] clouds...” Mark 13:26 and the Greek version of Daniel may be only marginally different, however, these differences are significant. LXX and Θ both report the contents of a vision (i.e. I saw a vision, and in the vision a man was coming with the clouds, etc), whereas Mark takes the content of Daniel’s vision to be what people will actually see (i.e. and then they will see the Son of Man coming with clouds...). According to A. Y. Collins, Jesus “referred in

³¹² J. Boyer, “The Classification of Participles: A Statistical Study,” *GTJ* 5 (1984): 172.

³¹³ D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 647.

his teaching to Dan 7:13 as an eschatological prophecy about to be fulfilled.”³¹⁴ In other words, Mark anticipates in some way the fulfilment of the vision of Dan 7 in the eschatological drama he narrates.

Because the obvious allusion to Daniel is not introduced as a quotation, M. Müller suggests that “it was not so much the expression itself as what is related in Dan. 7:13 about the one like a Son of man which was of interest.”³¹⁵ Similarly, Wright cautions against focusing solely on the expression and thereby disregarding the “whole narrative sequence of Daniel (especially chapter 7) and the ways in which that narrative could be invoked, echoed or otherwise appropriated”.³¹⁶ Consequently, μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς in Mark 13:26 is most likely a summary or interpretation of Dan 7:14, which depicts the “one like a son of man” being given authority, glory, and the kingdom (LXX: ἐξουσία; Θ: ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία). It is possible that μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς is simply a Markan elaboration unrelated to the vision of Dan 7, however, a further examination of the immediate context of Dan 7:13-14 makes it difficult to dismiss the similarities between the two texts. In the vision of Dan 7:13-14, the son of man figure comes with the clouds of heaven and is presented before the Ancient One. The following figure compares the differences between the LXX and Θ of Dan 7:14.

Figure 19: A Comparison of LXX and Θ at Dan 7:14.

LXX	Θ
καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῷ λατρεύουσα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἄρθῃ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἥτις οὐ μὴ φθαρῇ	καὶ αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία καὶ πάντες οἱ λαοὶ φυλαί γλῶσσαι αὐτῷ δουλεύσουσιν ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος ἥτις οὐ παρελεύσεται καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ οὐ διαφθαρήσεται

³¹⁴ A. Y. Collins, “Influence”, 105.

³¹⁵ Müller, *Son of Man*, 5.

³¹⁶ Wright, *Jesus*, 514.

The “one like a son of man” is given authority (LXX: ἐξουσία / Θ: ἡ ἀρχη), glory/honour (Θ: ἡ τιμη), and the kingdom (Θ: ἡ βασιλεία). All people will worship and serve him. His authority will be forever, and his kingdom will never end.³¹⁷ Could it be that Mark’s μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς is a paraphrase of the exaltation of the “one like a son of man” in Dan 7:14? Culpepper suggests that the language of “power and glory” should be associated with “the arrival of an earthly (Roman) monarch”, and that the coming of the Son of Man will be far greater.³¹⁸ However, parallels with “power and glory” language can also be observed in the Hebrew Bible. In the Hebrew Bible, the combination of δύναμις and δόξα is only ever ascribed to God, as seen in texts like Ps 23:10 (LXX), τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, and in Ps 62:3, οὕτως ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ ὥφθην σοι τοῦ ἰδεῖν τὴν δυνάμιν σου καὶ τὴν δόξαν σου. Psalm 67:35 LXX even has a connection between power, glory, and clouds (δύναμις, δόξα, and νεφέλαι): “Give glory to God, his majesty is over Israel and his power in the clouds” (δότε δόξαν τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραηλ ἡ μεγαλοπρέπεια αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς νεφέλαις).³¹⁹

While it is true that δύναμις and δόξα are lexically dissimilar to ἐξουσία, ἀρχή, τιμή and βασιλεία, there is certainly a conceptual similarity to these terms. In any case, the language of the power and glory of Jesus the Son of Man in Mark 13:26 is exalted language that echoes the language of the exaltation of the Danielic

³¹⁷ The authority of the “one like a son of man” is linked to his newly bestowed status as king. Further corroborating this view, the preferred reading of Dan 7:14 in Ziegler’s critical text is that not only is the “one like a son of man” given ἐξουσία, he is given ἐξουσία βασιλική (royal authority); Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 338. Nickelsburg’s contention that the vision of Dan 7 is a heavenly enthronement scene of sorts is well-founded. See G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism. Expanded Edition*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2007), 287.

³¹⁸ Culpepper, *Mark*, 467.

³¹⁹ My own translation.

“one like a son of man”. It is an exaltation of the highest order, employing language that is normally reserved for speaking about Israel’s God. Wright believes that Dan 7 speaks to the exaltation of one who, “representing ‘the people of the saints of the most high’, is raised up...and given a throne to sit on, exercising royal power.”³²⁰ Mark’s language, μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς, is consistent with the picture Wright paints. In addition, Hooker also notices that “in Mark 8:38-9:1, the glory is linked with the coming of the Son of Man, the power with the Kingdom of God: here they are both interpreted as attributes of the Son of man.”³²¹ The language Mark employs certainly suggests that he is aware of the larger context of Dan 7.

In Mark 2:10, in the episode where Jesus heals the paralytic, the authority (ἐξουσίαν) to forgive sins is attributed to the Son of Man. Jesus tells the paralytic, “But so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins...stand up, take your mat and go to your home.”³²² In Mark 2:28, Jesus’ authority is observed in the aphoristic statement given at the end of the conflict with the Pharisees over the observance of Sabbath: “[S]o the Son of Man is lord even of the sabbath” (κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου). Peter Müller also notices this, noting more generally that “a reception of Dan. 7.13 is basically the background for the use of the Son of man in Mark, hinted at in the sayings about the ἐξουσία of the Son of man in Mk 2.10, 28 and more explicitly stated in the allusions in 13.26 and 14.62.”³²³ In fact, in the rest of Mark Jesus is frequently depicted as the one who has authority (ἐξουσίαν).³²⁴

³²⁰ Wright, *Jesus*, 524.

³²¹ Hooker, *Mark*, 319.

³²² Mark 2:10.

³²³ P. Müller, ‘Zwischen dem Gekommenen und dem Kommenden. Intertextuelle Aspekte der Menschensohnaussagen im Markusevangelium’. In Dieter Sänger (ed.), *Gottessohn und Menschensohn*. Biblisch-theologischer Studien 67 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004),

Several scholars have suggested that the theme of authority is the common thread through all of the Son of Man sayings in Mark.³²⁵ Hooker writes that “all [the Markan sayings] are expressions of this authority, whether it is an authority which is exercised now, which is denied and so leads to suffering, or which will be acknowledged and vindicated in the future.”³²⁶ Opponents of this view³²⁷ who protest that the theme of authority is only really present in Mark 2:10 and 28 fail to acknowledge the influence of Dan 7:14 on the language of “power and glory” in Mark 13:26. In Ziegler’s critical edition of the LXX, the “one like a son of man” figure is not only given authority, but ἐξουσία βασιλική (*royal authority*). If this reading is a viable option, then perhaps the explicit connection between authority and kingship in Dan 7 might also be adopted and assimilated by those who make use of that text.³²⁸

3.2.4.5.3 FUNCTION IN MARK

The literary function of the reference of Mark 13:26 to Dan 7:13-14 is very significant because it is used to develop and inform Mark’s conception of the kingdom of God, the Messiah, and his Son of Man christology. The coming of the Son of Man is not only the climax of the Markan Apocalypse in Mark 13, but it is also a proleptic view of the coming of the kingdom of God. Throughout Mark’s

155: “Es ist vielmehr zuerkennen, dass auf einen von Dan 7 beeinflussten Motiv- und Argumentationskomplex zurückgegriffen wird”.

³²⁴ Mark 1:22, 27; 2:10; 11:28-29, 33.

³²⁵ I.e. H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 218; M. D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term “Son of Man” and its Use in St Mark’s Gospel* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967), 180; I. H. Marshall, *The Origins of New Testament Christology*. 2nd ed. (Downer’s Grove: IVP, 1990), 77.

³²⁶ Hooker, *Son of Man*, 180.

³²⁷ N. Perrin, *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 69-70; D. Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (SNTS 107; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 49-50.

³²⁸ Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 338.

gospel, there is an expectation of the coming of the kingdom starting with Jesus' introductory kingdom proclamation in Mark 1:15, and ending with the description of Joseph of Arimathea as someone whom is "waiting expectantly for the kingdom of God" in Mark 15:43. A. Y. Collins' suggestion that Mark 13 is a further elaboration on the teachings about the Son of Man in Mark 8:31-9:1 illustrates the importance of Mark 13 concerning the kingdom of God.³²⁹

The teachings about the coming of the Son of Man in Mark 8:31-9:1 are concluded with a statement that is directly related to the kingdom of God. Jesus tells his disciples, "Truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death until they see that the kingdom of God has come with power."³³⁰ This statement immediately follows Jesus' comment about the coming of the Son of Man "in the glory of the Father with the holy angels."³³¹ Therefore, the implication in Mark 13:26 is that the eschatological coming of the Son of Man is also the coming of the kingdom of God.

In addition, it has been discussed above that the mention of the coming of the Son of Man μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς is either an allusion to or interpretation of Dan 7:14, where the "one like a son of man" is given the kingdom that had been taken from the beastly nations (Dan 7:12).³³² A. Y. Collins also observes this element, going as far as to say that "in Dan 7:14 it is explicitly stated that the manlike figure is given kingdom."³³³ Nickelsburg maintains that "[a]lthough the 'one like a son of man' is never called 'king' or 'anointed one' (messiah), this

³²⁹ A. Y. Collins, "Influence", 98.

³³⁰ Mark 9:1.

³³¹ Mark 8:38.

³³² "As for the rest of the beasts, their dominion was taken away, but their lives were prolonged for a season and a time." (Dan 7:12.)

³³³ A. Y. Collins, "Influence", 93.

heavenly figure is given royal powers and prerogatives (‘dominion, glory, and kingship’)...”³³⁴ As R. D. Rowe has also shown in his work on the use of the Psalms in Mark, “according to Mark, Jesus (following the Psalms and other Old Testament passages) linked the concept of Messiahship/divine sonship with the kingdom of God”.³³⁵ Rowe has argued elsewhere that the figure of Dan 7:13 has a messianic role;³³⁶ the fact that Mark combines Dan 7:13 with Ps 110:1 in Mark 14:62 further strengthens the connection between the messiah, the “one like a son of man”, and the kingdom of God. Similarly, Moyise considers Dan 7:13 to be “an enthronement oracle” much like Ps 110:1 in its message and content.³³⁷

The connection between the Markan Son of Man and the kingdom of God has been analyzed by Jens Schröter, who claims that “the decisive designation with which the claim that Jesus is the representative of the βασιλεία is expressed in ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.”³³⁸ M. Müller notes that it is not merely the expression itself that is significant, but that what is conveyed in Dan 7 about the Son of Man is even more important. Therefore, even though Culpepper stresses that “there is no reference to the throne of God” in Mark’s reference to Dan 7,³³⁹ the theme of the kingdom of God is far from absent in Mark 13.

³³⁴ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 283.

³³⁵ R. D. Rowe, *God’s Kingdom and God’s Son. The Background to Mark’s Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 307.

³³⁶ R. D. Rowe, “Is Daniel’s ‘son of man’ messianic?” in *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology presented to Donald Guthrie*, ed. H. Rowdon (Downers Grove: IVP, 1982), 71-96.

³³⁷ ³³⁷ Moyise, *Jesus and Scripture*, 27.

³³⁸ J. Schröter, ‘Jesus, der Menschensohn. Zum Ansatz der Christologie in *Markus and Q*’, in *idem, Jesus und die Anfänge der Christologie. Methodologische und exegetische Studien zu den Ursprüngen des christlichen Glaubens* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001), 140-79. The quote is taken from the English version: ‘The Son of Man as the Representative of God’s Kingdom: On the Interpretation of Jesus in Mark and Q’, in Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt (eds.), *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 54. See also P. Müller, “Gekommenen”, 157.

³³⁹ Culpepper, *Mark*, 466.

For example, the Markan addition of μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς is likely an interpretation of Dan 7:14 in which the “one like a son of man” is given dominion. Concerning the “one like a son of man” and the kingdom in Dan 7, J. J. Collins writes, “The ‘one like a human being’ who appears in v 13 is given a kingdom, so it is reasonable to assume that he is enthroned, even though his enthronement is not actually described.”³⁴⁰ In addition, as Mark 9:1 indicates, for Mark the coming of the Son of Man is also the coming of the kingdom of God “in power”.

The Son of Man in Mark 13:26 also has messianic connotations. The warnings leading up to the revelation of the coming of the Son of Man in Mark 13:26 presuppose a coming messiah figure. There are multiple instances in Mark 13³⁴¹ where Jesus warns his disciples against false messiahs: “And if anyone says to you at that time, ‘Look! Here is the Messiah!’ or ‘Look! There he is!’—do not believe it.”³⁴² Not only is there an expectation of a coming messiah, that messiah is assumed to be Jesus. Hence, the other warnings are against those who claim to be him, or come in his name: “Many will come in my name and say, ‘I am he!’ and they will lead many astray”.³⁴³

Consequently, when the climactic moment is revealed in Mark 13:26, the moment of the coming of the Son of Man, his coming is to be understood as the coming of Jesus the messiah. C. von Lengerke, and more recently M. Shepherd, suggest that perhaps the “one like a son of man” figure in Daniel is already “an individual, messianic figure” who was identified as such “by Jesus and the NT

³⁴⁰ J. J. Collins, *Daniel*, 301.

³⁴¹ Mark 13:6, 21.

³⁴² Mark 13:21.

³⁴³ Mark 13:6.

authors”.³⁴⁴ Similarly, Nickelsburg contends that the Danielic “one like a son of man” figure “became traditional in some forms of Jewish and early Christian speculation that anticipated a transcendent eschatological agent of divine judgment and deliverance.”³⁴⁵ While many recent scholars strongly maintain that “Son of Man” was not a pre-established title and would contest Shepherd’s claim that there were expectations in early Judaism of the coming of a Danielic “one like a son of man”,³⁴⁶ there were at least some Jews who had those expectations, as is evidenced by the following.

As seen in the survey of Daniel in early Jewish literature in chapter two of this study, both the *Similitudes of Enoch* and 4 Ezra share the Markan identification of the “one like a son of man” figure as the Messiah. A. Y. Collins notes that in these Jewish texts there is the notion that “this figure is preexistent; the expectation that he will take an active role in the destruction of the wicked; and the implication that he acts in Gods’ stead.”³⁴⁷ Wright, similarly asserts that although the Danielic “one like a son of man” was “not necessarily ‘messianic’ in its original setting, [it] was in fact read in this way, by some Jews at least, in roughly the time of Jesus.”³⁴⁸ In Ziegler’s critical edition of the LXX, the “one like a son of man” figure is not only given authority, but ἐξουσία βασιλική (*royal authority*). If this reading is a viable option, then perhaps the explicit connection between authority and kingship in Dan 7 might also be adopted and assimilated by those who make use of that text.³⁴⁹ While it may

³⁴⁴ C. von Lengerke, *Das Buch Daniel. Verdeutscht und ausgelegt* (Königsberg: Bornträger, 1835), 336; M. B. Shepherd, “Dan 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man,” *WTJ* 68 (2006): 99, 111.

³⁴⁵ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 281.

³⁴⁶ N. Perrin, “Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man,” *NTS* 18 (1972): 243-67; M. Casey, “The Use of the Term ‘Son of Man’ in the *Similitudes of Enoch*,” *JSJ* 7 (1976): 29. Casey writes, “...there never was any such concept in Judaism at all.” in M. Casey, *Son of Man*, 112.

³⁴⁷ A. Y. Collins, “Influence”, 90.

³⁴⁸ Wright, *Jesus*, 514.

³⁴⁹ Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 338.

not be the dominant view, the textual data suggests that there is an association between the Son of Man and a messiah figure.³⁵⁰

Regardless of whether a Jewish messianic concept based on the figure of Dan 7 existed or not, Mark is clearly employing the expression in this way. M. Müssner's excellent assessment of the Son of Man debate is especially relevant to this discussion:

Although a more or less colourless circumlocution in its origin, in the Gospels [the Son of Man expression] gained a certain content through its placement in the construction of the story of the earthly Jesus as the Messiah... This fits with the new development in the understanding of New Testament christology; namely, not primarily as an effort to go after different 'titles' as if they convey the meaning of Jesus as God's salvific intervention. This becomes ever more visible in what is said of Jesus, his preaching, teaching, wonders and other deeds bringing the Kingdom of God near. In this theological context, titles are understood primarily as pointers to the understanding which appears from the story. What the Gospels' Jesus is doing constitutes the content of christology.³⁵¹

The editorial insertion of the definite articles to Daniel's anarthrous υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, identifies the heavenly figure of Dan 7 with Jesus, who refers to himself as the Son of Man in Mark. Consequently, the insertion of the definite article is an interpretive tactic by Mark to encourage his audience to read Dan 7 in light of Jesus. In Mark, A. Y. Collins observes a pattern by which the identity of Jesus as the messiah is gradually developed via the Son of Man sayings in the narrative.³⁵² The first two Son of Man sayings in Mark 2:10 and 28 mention the authority of the Son of Man, but there is no indication of Jesus' identity as Messiah. In Mark 8:38, it is revealed that the Son of Man is coming "in the glory of his father with the holy angels". In Mark 13:26, the Son of Man is depicted as coming in clouds "with great

³⁵⁰ Nickelsburg argues that in its original context, the heavenly figure of Dan 7 "the bearer of God's eternal reign". Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 287, see also 312. See also R. D. Rowe, "Is Daniel's 'son of man' messianic?", 71-96.

³⁵¹ M. Müller, *Son of Man*, 419.

³⁵² A. Y. Collins, "Influence", 97.

power and glory”. And finally, in Mark 14:62, Jesus emphatically affirms that he is the Messiah and his opponents will see him “coming with the clouds of heaven”.

The progressive revelation of the Son of Man is an effective literary technique because it emphasizes that the true identity of Jesus is only finally revealed in his Passion. Even though his identity as the Son of Man is only fully revealed to the characters in the story in the trial scene before the Sanhedrin, Mark’s audience is fully aware of Jesus’ messianic identity from the very beginning. Consequently, even though the fuller implications of the meaning of the Son of Man, especially its connection to Dan 7, is only explicitly stated at the very end of Mark’s narrative, the audience is expected to assume its significance in earlier parts of the book.

However, it would be a mistake to assume that every Son of Man saying in Mark is a reference to Dan 7. Many of the Son of Man sayings have no connection whatsoever to the Danielic themes of a glorious messianic figure, the kingdom of God, judgment, or even authority.³⁵³ The key to understanding the use of the Son of Man is to acknowledge that the expression Son of Man first and foremost refers to the Markan character of Jesus, regardless of the context in which it appears and regardless of whether Dan 7 is appropriate to its setting. In this sense, the expression the “Son of Man” itself is not an allusion to Dan 7 in any of the Markan texts.

However, the Danielic “one like a son of man” most likely influenced the process by which the “Son of Man” became a self-referential title for Jesus.³⁵⁴ Larry Hurtado, a proponent of this view, affirms that “the [Son of Man]expression designated Jesus in particular, and it could be deployed in any statement intended to make reference to

³⁵³ Mark 8:31, 9:9,12, 31, 10:33, 14:21.

³⁵⁴ Whether it was a mistranslation of the Aramaic, or a post-Easter development by the Early Church, the fact remains that the Son of Man in Mark always refers to Jesus.

Jesus.”³⁵⁵ The function of the expression, then, is primarily a referential and not a descriptive.³⁵⁶ For Hurtado, the curious expression is preserved in the Gospel traditions not because it has any associations with Dan 7 but because it preserves Jesus’ own speech-practice.³⁵⁷ However, texts such as Mark 13:26 and 14:62 are clear references to Dan 7, alluding also to other details of the Danielic vision. For this reason, even if the connection of the expression to Dan 7 did not originate with Jesus, the Gospel writers certainly had Dan 7 in mind. In conclusion, every Son of Man saying is potentially related to the Danielic “one like a son of man”, not because the saying itself has any connection to the Danielic tradition, but because the saying is related to Jesus, whose identity in Mark has been shaped in part by Dan 7.

3.2.5. References in Chapter 14

The only reference to Daniel in Mark 14 that is identified by the NA27 and UBS4 is Dan 7:13, the same text alluded to in Mark 13:26. However, the setting of the reference in Mark 14 is not an extended discourse but a dialogue within a narrative sequence. In addition, the actual reference also differs slightly from Mark 13:26. The reference to Dan 7:13 in Mark 14:62 is a stronger allusion, including the Danielic element of “clouds of heaven”³⁵⁸ as well as the preposition μετὰ.

3.2.5.1 Mark 14:62 / Dan 7:13

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν
καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ...

³⁵⁵ Larry W. Hurtado, “Summary and Concluding Observations” in *Who Is This Son of Man? The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus*, eds. L. W. Hurtado, P. L. Owen (London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2011), 174.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., 166.

³⁵⁷ Ibid., 174-175.

³⁵⁸ Emphasis mine.

3.2.5.1.1 THE MARKAN CONTEXT

The reference to Daniel in Mark 14:62 is found in his Passion narrative (Mark 14:1-15:47), more specifically, in the account of Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin in Mark 14:53-65. Jesus also receives a trial before Pilate in Mark 15:1-15, but it is in his trial before the Jewish leadership that seals his fate.³⁵⁹ The purpose of the trial is made clear in Mark 14:55: "Now the chief priests and the whole council (ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον) were looking for testimony against Jesus to put him to death..." The Jews' intention to kill Jesus is a narrative element that is developed throughout Mark. In Jesus' first Passion prediction, he predicts that he will be "rejected by the elders, the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed..."³⁶⁰ This prediction is gradually fulfilled as the Jewish leaders' plot to kill Jesus unfolds.³⁶¹ Therefore, the trial in Mark 14:53-65 is not a fair trial, but an attempt to condemn Jesus to death.

From a narrative-critical perspective, the trial before the Sanhedrin is also the climax and culmination of the ongoing conflict between Jesus and the Jewish leadership throughout Mark's Gospel. After various unsuccessful attempts to use false testimony against Jesus (ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ),³⁶² the high priest interrogates him directly, asking Jesus, "Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One?"³⁶³ In response to this question, Jesus answers, "I am; and 'you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power,' and 'coming with the clouds of heaven.'" ³⁶⁴ In Mark 8:39-30, Mark already revealed the identity of Jesus as the

³⁵⁹ Although Jesus is executed by the Romans, it is Mark's view that the Jews were responsible for the death of Jesus. See discussion in Hooker, *Mark*, 355; A. Y. Collins, *Mark*, 699.

³⁶⁰ Mark 8:31.

³⁶¹ Several times in Mark's narrative, the chief priests and scribes look for a way to kill Jesus. Mark 11:18; 14:1.

³⁶² Mark 14:56-59.

³⁶³ Mark 14:60.

³⁶⁴ Mark 14:61-62.

Messiah to his disciples, but they were warned not to disclose this information to anyone (μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ). In Jesus' declaration to the high priest, his identity as the Messiah is made known to those outside his inner group for the first time in Mark's gospel. H. L. Chronis considers Mark 14:62 to be the "formal disclosure of his identity".³⁶⁵ Jesus' affirmation of his messianic identity is framed by allusions to two Hebrew Bible scriptures: Ps 110:1 and Dan 7:13. These two texts are referenced together, with the Son of Man as the subject for both clauses.

In Ps 110 there is a human "lord" who sits on a throne beside God, and who is given dominion to rule and to exact judgment among the nations. Psalm 110:1 (109:1 LXX) reads, "The Lord said to my Lord, 'Sit on my right until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet'" (Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου). There is no indication that Ps 110 was understood in early Jewish literature to be messianic, but the Synoptic evangelists, especially Mark, certainly interpreted it this way.³⁶⁶ The reference to Ps 110 has three possible functions.

Firstly, it further identifies Jesus as the Messiah. It has already been established in the discussion of Mark 13:26 that the Son of Man in Mark refers to none other than Jesus. Therefore, when Mark presents the Son of Man as the one who will be seated at God's right hand, he is conveying that Jesus should be understood in terms of the messiah who is described in Ps 110. Secondly, Ps 110 describes the messiah figure with highly exalted language and Mark's allusion to Ps 110 might also be employed to convey the exalted status of the future vindicated

³⁶⁵ H. L. Chronis, "To Reveal and to Conceal: A Literary-Critical Perspective on 'the Son of Man' in Mark," *NTS* 51 (2005): 473.

³⁶⁶ Cf. Mark 12:35-37. For the view that early Judaism did not interpret Ps 110 as messianic, see A. Y. Collins, *Mark*, 579-80.

Jesus. Thirdly, Mark may also have employed Ps 110 due to its theme of the judgment of the Messiah's enemies. In Ps 110 there is mention of the judicial function of the Messiah and that God will subject his enemies under his feet: "Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool."³⁶⁷ In the context of Mark 14:53-65 Jesus is surrounded by his enemies, and the reference to Ps 110:1 could also function as Jesus' condemnation of the Jewish leaders who are plotting against him.³⁶⁸ Hooker notes that the reference to Ps 110 is a challenge and not a reassurance; it is "addressed to Jesus' enemies who will find themselves judged hereafter because of their refusal to acknowledge him".³⁶⁹

The reference to Ps 110:1 is combined with a reference to Dan 7:13, where a human-like messianic figure is presented to God to be bestowed glory, honour, and most importantly, the kingdom. Even though only the element of the "one like a son of man coming with the clouds of heaven" is quoted, the juxtaposition of this reference beside the Ps 110 reference, as well as the high priest's question regarding Jesus' messianic identity, suggests that the larger context of the vision of Dan 7 is also being invoked. In other words, the reference is much more than a prophecy foretelling the return of Jesus in an exalted state, as A. Collins suggests.³⁷⁰ Together with the reference to Ps 110:1, it primarily functions as the scriptural basis for Jesus' response to the high priest that he is indeed the Messiah. Wright considers Dan 7 and Ps 110 to be "two key messianic passages which Jesus has already used in

³⁶⁷ Ps 110:1.

³⁶⁸ "...Jesus' announcement of his vindication involves [his opponents'] own condemnation." Hooker, *Mark*, 357.

³⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 361.

³⁷⁰ A. Y. Collins, *Mark*, 705. Collins suggests that the emphasis of the Danielic reference is on the "public vindication of Jesus as Son of Man". See A. Y. Collins, "Influence", 98.

interpreting both his Temple-action and his messianic claim”.³⁷¹ These texts, both of which are directly associated with the Son of Man (i.e., Jesus) by Mark in 14:62, relate how a human figure can also become the heavenly and exalted Messiah. Marcus observes that “although the phrase ‘sitting at the right hand’ in 14:62 is most directly an allusion to Ps. 110:1, it is also consonant with the picture in Dan. 7:13-14 of the human like figure being presented to the Ancient of Days.”³⁷² Conceptually, both Ps 110:1 and Dan 7:13 describe an exalted human or human-like messianic figure that is triumphant over his enemies. Therefore, Mark’s combination of these texts is highly relevant to Jesus’ affirmative answer to the high priest about his messianic identity.

3.2.5.1.2 DANIEL IN MARK

Mark 14:62 displays a close linguistic as well as conceptual overlap with Dan 7:13 Θ, and is the most definite allusion to Daniel found in Mark’s gospel. The following figure shows the similarities between Mark 14:62, the related Danielic texts, and Mark 13:26.

Figure 20: A Comparison of the Texts of Mark 14:62, 13:26 and Dan 7:13.

Mark 14:62
ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.
Mark 13:26
καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.
Daniel 7:13

³⁷¹ Wright, *Jesus*, 524.

³⁷² J. Marcus, *Way*, 165.

LXX	ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ ³⁷³ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο ³⁷⁴ , καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρήν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρήσαν αὐτῷ.
Θ	ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος ἦν ³⁷⁵ καὶ ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐφθασεν καὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ³⁷⁶ προσηνέχθη.
MT	חזה הוית בחזוי ליליא וארו עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוה ועד עתיק יומיא מטה וקדמויה הקרבויה

The Danielic reference in Mark 14:62 is a stronger allusion to Dan 17:13 than the one in Mark 13:26. There are three noticeable differences between the Danielic references in the two Markan texts.

The first difference is that Mark 14:62 includes the Danielic modifier “of heaven” (τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) whereas Mark 13:26 does not. The clouds “of heaven” appear in both Greek versions of Daniel and in the Aramaic text. The second distinction between the two Markan references to Daniel is the use of the preposition μετὰ “the clouds of heaven”. A comparison with the Greek versions of Daniel reveals that only Θ uses this preposition with “the clouds of heaven”. The third difference is that Mark 14:62 does not contain the interpretive gloss of Dan 7:14 (μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης), that appears in Mark 13:26. From these observations, it can be seen that Mark 14:62 was dependent on Θ Daniel, and that the Danielic references in the two Markan texts likely arose from independent traditions.

Conceptually, the reference to Daniel in Mark 14:62 also coheres with the Danielic context. The allusion to Daniel is short and fragmentary; the only detail

³⁷³ Some variants read μετὰ. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 338.

³⁷⁴ Ziegler places ἦρχετο before ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου. Ibid.

³⁷⁵ Ziegler omits ἦν. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 339.

³⁷⁶ Instead of ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, Ziegler’s text reads αὐτῷ. Ibid.

given is that someone is “coming with the clouds of heaven”. The important Danielic motifs that Mark intends his audience to notice include the messianic role of the one like a son of man, his exalted status, and the theme of judgment. These can only be understood if his audience is also familiar with the background of Dan 7.

Furthermore, the vision of Dan 7 depicts God as a judge who presides in a court to pass judgments against the four beasts. It is possible that Jesus’ statement is, as Hooker suggests,³⁷⁷ a challenge to the Jewish leadership and a pronouncement that the tables will be turned. When he is eventually vindicated by God, those who are judging him now are the ones who will be judged. The future indicative verb “you will see” (ὄψεσθε) in Mark 14:62 should also be understood as language pertaining to the theme of vindication.

Although they are now rejecting him in the present,³⁷⁸ there will come a time when they will see that Jesus is the Messiah. Wright adds, “In and through it all, [the high priest] will witness events which show that Jesus was not, after all, mistaken in his claim...he is the Messiah, the anointed one, the true representative of Israel, the one in and through whom the covenant god is acting to set up his kingdom.”³⁷⁹ While the Jewish leadership’s rejection of Jesus in Mark 14:62 is a tragic element in Mark’s narrative, it is not the end of the story.

3.2.5.1.3 FUNCTION IN MARK

The literary function of the reference to Daniel in Mark 14:62 is best understood in the context of Jesus’ affirmation of his identity as the Messiah before the Sanhedrin, as well the attendant reference to Ps 110. Mark 14:62 is a crucial moment in Mark’s

³⁷⁷ Hooker, *Mark*, 357, 361.

³⁷⁸ The rejection by the chief priests, elders, and scribes appears in Jesus’ first Passion prediction in Mark 8:31.

³⁷⁹ Wright, *Jesus*, 525.

gospel because it is here that Jesus publicly reveals his messianic identity. The irony in the narrative is that instead of accepting Jesus' claim to be the Messiah, the Jewish leadership reject him and ultimately sentence him to death. Mark alludes to two scriptures that accompany Jesus' climactic affirmation of the messianic identity. In the context of Jesus' trial, the introductory verb, "you will see" denotes a defiant response that simultaneously expresses the future vindication of Jesus and the condemnation of his opponents.

The vindication of a wronged righteous man is a common motif in various texts of early Judaism;³⁸⁰ however, the vindication of Jesus in Mark 14:62 is very specific. Mark 14:26 is not merely a vindication of the wrongly harmed Jesus (wrongly harmed as he was), it is more importantly a vindication of his claim to be the messiah. Wright suggests that the vindication of the Son of Man is the vindication of Jesus as "the true representative of YHWH's people."³⁸¹ Richard France also considers the Son of Man language is about "vindication and enthronement of the Son of Man at the right hand of God, to receive and exercise supreme authority."³⁸² Together with the reference to Ps 110:1, the reference to Dan 7:13 simultaneously affirms Jesus' messianic status, anticipates his future exaltation, and announces the eventual judgment of the Jewish leadership.

A comparison of Mark 13:26 and 14:62 is revealing because although both texts make references to the same Danielic text, the function of the reference in each text is unique. Mark 13:26 employs Dan 7:13 to express the decisive eschatological moment when the kingdom of God will come. Jesus is identified as the messiah who

³⁸⁰ E.g. The book of Daniel, Wisdom of Solomon, 1 Maccabees, *Joseph and Aseneth*, etc. See a fuller discussion of the vindication of the persecuted righteous in Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 67-122.

³⁸¹ Wright, *Jesus*, 524.

³⁸² Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2001), 501.

will come on the clouds “with great power and glory”. The function of the Danielic reference in the context of the apocalypse of Mark 13 is to illustrate a significant moment in the eschatological drama Mark composes. Mark 14:62 uses the same text but the function is to reinforce Jesus’ messianic identity before his opponents and to foreshadow his future exaltation.

3.2.6 Other Possible References to Daniel

The previous discussions all involved Danielic references that have been acknowledged in the NA27 and UBS4 Greek New Testament texts. The following are two other Markan texts that also have similarities with the book of Daniel and may be considered as texts that also contain references to Daniel.

3.2.6.1 *Mark 8:38 / Dan 7:13-14*

In Mark 8:38, Jesus warns his disciples saying, “Those who are ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of them the Son of Man will also be ashamed when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.” This verse is not normally associated with Daniel, however, there are striking similarities with Mark 13:26, which is considered to contain a Danielic reference.³⁸³ There are two lexical similarities with Dan 7:13: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and the verb ἔλθῃ (aorist subjunctive of ἔρχομαι). On their own, these similarities are not convincing examples of literary dependence. However, when the other elements of Mark 8:38 are also considered, a different picture emerges.

Mark 8:38 also mentions that the Son of Man is coming “in the glory of his Father” and “with the holy angels”. These details have eschatological significance. In

³⁸³ A. Y. Collins also considers Mark 8:38 to be a reference to Dan 7:13, “The first use of the phrase “Son of Man” in Mark that clearly alludes to Dan 7:13 occurs in 8:38...” A. Y. Collins, *Mark*, 98. See also J. Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 164.

Mark 13:26, the Son of Man who comes with clouds also comes with great power and glory (μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης). It has been observed in the previous discussion that μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης is likely to be a paraphrase or interpretation of Dan 7:14, a text that describes the “one like a son of man” being given glory and authority and a kingdom.

In view of this, Mark 8:38’s mention of the Son of Man coming in the “glory of his Father” should also be understood in relation to the image of the triumphant Danielic figure. While the detail about “the holy angels” in Mark 8:38 does not have a counter part in Dan 7:13-14, this element appears in the third stage of Mark’s eschatological drama in Mark 13. Mark explains that after the decisive coming of the Son of Man, “he will send out the angels, and gather his elect from the four winds...”³⁸⁴ When compared with Mark 13:26, Mark 8:38 appears to be using Dan 7:13-14 in a similar fashion. Therefore, on its own, the Danielic allusion in Mark 8:38 is considerably weak, but when it is considered alongside the similarities to Mark 13:26, a connection to the vision of Dan 7 can clearly be seen.

3.2.6.2 Mark 14:58 /Dan 2:34, 45

In Mark 14:58, false witnesses accuse Jesus of claiming to destroy the temple and of building another that has “not [been] made with hands”. Evans has suggested that this may be a reference to the stone from Dan 2.³⁸⁵ In the dream of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 2:34, Daniel sees a stone that is “not [cut] by human hands” which strikes the feet of the statue and dashes it to pieces. This stone then becomes a great mountain and fills the earth. In Daniel’s interpretation of the dream in Dan 2:45, he explains to

³⁸⁴ Mark 13:27.

³⁸⁵ Evans, “Daniel in the New Testament”, 511.

the king that the stone “cut from the mountain not by hands” is the eternal kingdom of the God of heaven. It should be noted that in the Hebrew Bible, Daniel is the only text that expresses the kingdom of God with the phrasing of a stone that is cut “not by hands”.

The Markan term “not by hands” ἀχειροποίητος is rare; it only appears once in the Gospels, once in 2 Corinthians, and once in Colossians, and twice in Hebrews in the form of οὐ + χειροποίητος. Various explanations have been given for the interpretation of the meaning of “not by hands”. A. Y. Collins suggests that it may be a polemical indictment of the Jewish temple establishment and that “not by hands” is a contrast to an idolatrous temple made with hands.³⁸⁶ Hooker contends that “not by hands” refers to the age to come, “when God himself would rebuild the temple.”³⁸⁷ Culpepper considers the temple “not made with hands” to be a metaphor for the Christian church, whose believers would be the new temple, “the new center of God’s presence on earth”.³⁸⁸ However, none of these suggestions take into account the eternal nature of something “not made by hands” in the writings of Paul and the author of Hebrews.

2 Corinthians and Hebrews both emphasize the “eternal” character of something by describing it as “not made by hands”. In 2 Cor 5:1, Paul writes, “For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, *eternal in the heavens*.”³⁸⁹ Similarly, in Heb 9:1, the author of Hebrews writes, “But when Christ came as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and perfect tent (not made with

³⁸⁶ A. Y. Collins, *Mark*, 702.

³⁸⁷ Hooker, *Mark*, 359.

³⁸⁸ Culpepper, *Mark*, 533.

³⁸⁹ Emphasis Mine.

hands, that is, not of this creation), he entered once for all into the Holy Place, not with the blood of goats and calves, but with his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption.” Understood in the light of these texts, the temple built “not with hands” in Mark 14:55 is one that will endure forever. It is possible that this understanding is derived from Dan 2:24-25:

And in the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, nor shall this kingdom be left to another people. It shall crush all these kingdoms and bring them to an end, and it shall stand forever; just as you saw that a stone was cut from the mountain not by hands, and that it crushed the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver, and the gold.

According to Wright, the stone “represents the kingdom which shall never be destroyed, which the creator god will establish in those days”.³⁹⁰ Consequently, in Mark 14:55, the witnesses accuse Jesus of declaring that the present temple will be destroyed and will be replaced by an eternal temple “not made by hands”.

3.3 Summary

From the analysis of the ten Markan texts identified by the NA27 and UBS4 texts to contain Danielic references, it has been determined that eight out of the ten texts contain Danielic references (Mark 1:15; 4:11; 4:32; 13:13; 13:14; 13:19; 13:26 and 14:62), while two of them do not (Mark 9:1; 13:7). The NA27 text’s distinction between direct quotations and definite allusions should be revised. None of the references are demarcated by a citation-formula, and only small segments of the source-text are quoted. The texts identified as containing direct quotations (Mark 4:32; 13:14; 13:26; 14:62) are in actuality paraphrases and do not necessarily constitute a stronger literary relationship than other texts which have not been

³⁹⁰ Wright, *Jesus*, 231.

included. Furthermore, it is likely that both Mark 8:38 and 14:55 are also texts that contain Danielic references.

The chapters of Daniel that are quoted are from Dan 2, 4, 7 and 12—texts that belong to Daniel’s visionary materials rather than the court legends.³⁹¹ The figure of Daniel is not mentioned, nor are tales of him or his companions. Twice in Mark, the allusion to Daniel appears in a composite of references including other known Hebrew Bible scriptures, suggesting Mark also considers Daniel to be an authoritative text. Mark’s references to Daniel agree most consistently with the Θ translation of Daniel, although there is also some indication he might have depended on the LXX in Mark 13:14, and perhaps the Aramaic text in Mark 4:32.

The Danielic references are found in four different stages in Mark’s narrative: Jesus’ introductory kingdom proclamation in Mark 1, parables about the kingdom in Mark 4, teachings about the coming of the kingdom in Mark 13, and Jesus’ affirmation of the messianic identity in Mark 14. The fuller import of this distribution will be discussed more fully in the following chapter.

The two major functions of the Danielic references pertain to Daniel’s conception of the kingdom of God as well as his eschatology. The Danielic references both complement and develop these important themes in Mark. The significance of these observations will be discussed more fully in the following chapter. This chapter will conclude with the following figure, which is a summary of the results gathered in this chapter for comparison. Included in the figure below is the Markan text, the Danielic reference, whether the NA27, UBS4 and the present

³⁹¹ Dan 2 and 4 are part of Daniel’s court narratives; however, only the content in the visions and their interpretations are referenced by Mark.

study (LO) acknowledges the reference, the version of Daniel referenced, and the function of the reference.

Figure 21: A Summary of the Findings of Chapter 3 of the Thesis.

Markan Text	Danielic Reference	NA27	UBS4	LO	Version Referenced	Function
Mark 1:15	Dan 7:22	Yes	No	Yes	Θ	Kingdom
Mark 4:11	Dan 2:27-47	Yes	No	Yes	Θ	Kingdom
Mark 4:32	Dan 4: 9, 18	Direct Quotation	Yes	Yes	MT	Kingdom
Mark 8:38	Dan 7:13	No	No	Yes	?	Kingdom
Mark 9:3	Dan 7:9	Yes	No	No	----	----
Mark 13:7	Dan 2:28-27, 45	Yes	No	No	----	----
Mark 13:13	Dan 12:12	Yes	No	Yes	Θ	Eschatology
Mark 13:14	Dan 12:11/ 11:31/9:27	Direct Quotation	Yes	Yes	LXX	Eschatology
Mark 13:19	Dan 12:1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Θ	Eschatology
Mark 13:26	Dan 7:13-14	Direct Quotation	Yes	Yes	Θ	Eschatology/ Kingdom
Mark 14:55	Dan 2:34, 45	No	No	Yes	?	Kingdom
Mark 14:62	Dan 7:13	Direct Quotation	Yes	Yes	Θ	Kingdom

CHAPTER 4—THE CONTOURS AND FUNCTIONS OF DANIELIC REFERENCES IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

4.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, the specific contours and functions of individual Markan references to Daniel were examined. In this chapter, the implications of these observations will be explored more fully with the purpose of better understanding Mark's broader use of Daniel. How does Mark's use of Daniel compare to that of other early Jewish writers? What patterns of usage can be observed and how do they complement Mark's narrative and themes? What does looking at the Danielic references as a whole reveal about how Mark uses Daniel? The following analysis will be based on the data collected in the previous two chapters, "The Use of Daniel in Early Jewish Literature" and "The Use of Daniel in Mark".

4.2. A Comparison Between Mark's Use of Daniel With Other Early Jewish Writers

Mark's use of Daniel is both similar and dissimilar to the use of Daniel by other early Jewish writers. The most striking difference in Mark's usage of Daniel is that although the majority of early Jewish texts allude to the character of Daniel and the legends associated with him, Mark makes no mention of either. In various early Jewish texts, elements from the Danielic legends are highlighted. For example, some

texts highlight Daniel's faithful endurance and integrity,¹ while others emphasize God's deliverance of Daniel.² Some texts include Daniel and his companions in lists of Israel's faithful ancestors,³ while other texts mention Daniel by name and label him as a prophet.⁴ Josephus is especially effusive in his praise of Daniel, describing him as "one of the greatest of the prophets" (ἐνί τινι τῶν μεγίστων).⁵ Mark, however, does not acknowledge Daniel by name nor does he allude to any narrative elements of the tales associated with him. In this regard, Mark's use of Daniel differs markedly from other early Jewish writers.

However, there are also some parallels between Mark's use of Daniel and his contemporaries. Mark generally employs materials from the visionary chapters of Daniel (chs. 7-12), however, he also alludes to some of the visionary elements from the legendary chapters (chs. 2 and 4).⁶ Daniel's visionary content is also widely read and utilized by various early Jewish writers. Some writers allude to a specific expression from Daniel, such as the "desolating sacrilege",⁷ while other writers allude to the larger context of particular visions. For example, various texts make use of the four kingdom schema of Dan 2 and 7. World powers are represented by various symbols (eagle, cedars, talking trees),⁸ and the fourth kingdom is depicted as more formidable than the rest. These images resonate with Daniel's depiction of kingdoms with different metals in a statue in Dan 2, with the different types of beasts in Dan 7, and with the motif of the fourth kingdom being the strongest. This fourth

¹ 1 Macc 2:59; 4 Macc 16:21.

² 3 Macc 6:6-7.

³ 1 Macc 2:59; 4 Macc 16:24.

⁴ 4QPsDan Ar; 4Q174; Ant 10:249; 4 Ezra 12:11.

⁵ Ant 10:266. English translation taken from William Whiston, A.M., *The Works of Flavius Josephus, Complete and Unabridged. New Updated Edition.* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1987).

⁶ However, the narrative contexts of these materials are not included.

⁷ 1 Macc 1:54; Ant 10:276.

⁸ 4 Ezra 12:32-33; 2 Bar 36; 4Q552-553.

kingdom is condemned by God and superseded by a symbol of a completely different nature that represents the kingdom of God (a lion in 4 Ezra, a vine in 2 Baruch, etc), which also corresponds with the different-natured symbol for the kingdom of God in Daniel. In Dan 2 the kingdom of God is represented by a stone which is not metal like the rest, and a human-like creature among beasts in Dan 7. Josephus attests to the politically subversive interpretation of Dan 2 when he identifies Rome with the mighty fourth kingdom of iron, but refuses to elaborate on the subversive meaning of the stone—most likely to avoid offending his Roman patrons.⁹ Some texts also interpret the image which represents God’s kingdom as also a symbol for the messiah. The lion that destroys the eagle in 4 Ezra is explicitly described as a Davidic messiah,¹⁰ and the vine that replaces the cedar in 2 Baruch is also understood to be messianic.¹¹ The Similitudes of Enoch also features a human agent of God’s eschatological judgment and vindication known as “that son of man” and “anointed one”.¹² The fragmentary text of 4Q246 mentions a “son of God” and nations trampling other nations until the people of God arise and usher in the eternal kingdom of God.¹³

G. K. Beale has referred to the early Jewish use of Daniel as a “midrashic” *Vorbild* by which their own writing is patterned and from which clusters of allusions from the Danielic text are created.¹⁴ Mark’s use of Daniel is generally consistent with Beale’s general observations; it bears much resemblance to the use of Daniel by early Jewish writers as noted above. As in 1 Maccabees and Josephus’ *Antiquities*,

⁹ Ant 10:210.

¹⁰ 4 Ezra 12:32-33.

¹¹ 2 Bar 39:7

¹² 1 En 48:2; 62:5, 7, 9, 14; 63:11; 69:26, 27, 29; 70:1; 71:14, 17.

¹³ 4Q246 f1ii:1-5, 9.

¹⁴ G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984), 313-4.

Mark also alludes to Daniel's "desolating sacrilege". Mark's use of this expression is similar to Josephus' in that he is appropriating Daniel's vision of calamity to describe a new challenge for his community.¹⁵ The motif of kingdoms, in particular the kingdom of God, also appears in Mark. In Mark 13:8, Jesus warns that nations will rise up against nations and kingdoms against kingdoms (ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν), and the theme of the coming of the kingdom of God is a prominent theme throughout the gospel.¹⁶ The image of the "one like a son of man" from Dan 7 (analogous to the stone in Dan 2, the lion in 4 Ezra, the vine in 2 Baruch, etc) is employed at a crucial moment in Mark's narrative when Jesus' identity as Messiah is fully revealed. In the same way that early Jewish texts interpret the symbol representing the kingdom of God to be messianic, Mark also interprets the "one like a son of man" to be a heavenly figure¹⁷ who also has messianic characteristics.¹⁸ In the eschatological discourse of Mark 13, the false prophets and messianic pretenders, about whom the disciples were warned, are contrasted with the coming of the actual messiah, the Son of Man in clouds. Therefore, Mark 13 reveals that there were expectations for a coming messiah. Mark's use of Daniel's "one like a son of man" vision and the identification of that heavenly figure with Jesus strongly indicate a messianic interpretation of Dan 7.

Mark's use of Daniel in Mark 13:26 and 14:62 is similar to the use of Daniel in 4Q174, a Qumranic work in which various Hebrew Bible scriptures are quoted in a series along with corresponding interpretations which are related a specific theme.

¹⁵ Josephus interprets Daniel's "desolating sacrilege" to also refer to the Roman invasion as well as the things "under Antiochus Epiphanes". Cf. Ant 10:276.

¹⁶ Mark 1:15; 4:11; 9:1; 12:34.

¹⁷ "He comes with the glory of his Father with the holy angels". Mark 8:38.

¹⁸ He is associated with a kingdom (Mark 9:1), and he will gather his people from the ends of the earth (Mark 13:27).

In 4Q174 fragment 1, 3ii:3-4, Dan 12:10 is quoted along with references to Ps 2, Ezek 37:23, and Isa 8:11 in regard to “the time of persecution to come upon the House of Judah.”¹⁹ In other words, the writer of this Florilegium considers Daniel to be scripture and combines it with other scriptures in order to discuss a particular theological topic. This is similar to Mark 13:24-27, where Mark incorporates references to Isa 31:10, Isa 34:4, Dan 7:13 and various other restoration and gathering scriptural motifs to describe the scene of Jesus’ parousia. Mark is also doing something similar in Mark 14:62 when he combines Dan 7:13 with Psalm 110:1 to convey the notion that the earthly Jesus will be vindicated as the heavenly Son of Man as well as God’s messiah. It is significant that Mark considers Daniel to be scripture, but even more so that he employs Dan 7 (along with Ps 2) to affirm Jesus’ identity as Messiah.

It can be seen that Mark’s creative use of Daniel is not particularly unique when compared with other early Jewish texts. The reverence that writers held for Daniel did not hinder them from adapting the text. On the contrary, it encouraged writers to re-interpret Daniel for their own audiences and situations. Josephus, who considered Daniel to be a prophet *par excellence*, understood the prophecy about Antiochus to be equally relevant for his time.²⁰ The writer of 4 Ezra acknowledges Daniel’s vision of the beasts but claims to have additional revelations that go beyond Daniel’s text.²¹ The writers of the Parables of Enoch, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch all attribute the role of judgment to the messiah figure which is an element not explicitly

¹⁹ 4Q174 fragment 1, 3ii:1. Translation taken from M. O. Wise, M. G. Abegg, Jr., E. M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New English Translation*, (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2005).

²⁰ Ant 10:276.

²¹ 4 Ezra 12:11.

present in Dan 7.²² The writer of 4QFlorilegium combines a quotation of Dan 12:10 with a collection of other scriptures to articulate his own theological emphases.²³ Mark's innovations display a similar relationship with Daniel's visionary material in that he employs material from Daniel but imbues it with a new significance. He uses Daniel's harrowing image of the "desolating sacrilege" to refer to an event in his own audience's time.²⁴ He draws upon the eschatological framework of Daniel: the conflicts between kingdoms,²⁵ the calamity of the Jewish people,²⁶ the promise of divine intervention, and the establishment of the kingdom of God.²⁷ However, Mark also injects new significance into this framework by depicting Jesus as the one who will usher in the kingdom of God.²⁸ Similar to the literary technique of the writer of 4QFlorilegium, Mark also combines Daniel with other scriptures in an exegetical move to communicate his own theological emphases. There are many parallels between Mark's use of Daniel and other early Jewish writers. For Mark, the visionary content of Daniel is both authoritative in that it caused Mark to adopt its language and eschatological framework and inspirational in that it motivated Mark to adapt Daniel to communicate his own theological insights and innovations.

²² Nickelsburg unnecessarily denies any connection of the "one like a son of man" figure in Dan 7 with the motif of judgment, attributing any such concepts in the New Testament in relation to Dan 7 to apocalyptic traditions outside of Daniel (i.e. 1 Enoch 1-36). c.f. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity. Expanded Edition* (Harvard Theological Studies 56; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006), 287-288. However, in the vision of Dan 2, which is comparable in certain respects to Dan 7, the stone *does* play an active role in dashing the feet of the statue. Cf. Dan 2:34.

²³ 4Q174 fragment 1, 3ii:3-4.

²⁴ Some scholars also argue that Mark's "desolating sacrilege" looks forward to an event that has not yet occurred for Mark's audience.

²⁵ There are various mentions of military conflicts in Daniel—particularly the fourth kingdom described in Dan 2 and 7.

²⁶ Dan 12:1.

²⁷ Dan 2:44; 7:13-14; 12:1, etc.

²⁸ Mark 13:26.

4.3. The Overall Contours and Functions of Danielic References in Mark

The following is an analysis and discussion of the data collected on the contours and functions of individual Danielic references in Mark in the previous chapter.

Observations from the exegetical analysis of individual Markan texts will be drawn together to construct a hypothesis for how Mark tends to employ Danielic materials in his writing. The discussion will include a consideration of the overarching contours of Danielic usage in Mark, a synthetic treatment of the literary functions of Markan Danielic usage, and an argument for the cumulative effect of Danielic references on the narrative and themes of Mark.

4.3.1 The Overall Contours of Markan Use of Daniel

Of the ten Markan references to Daniel noted by the NA27 text, eight were considered to be valid references which were determined on the basis of lexical, grammatical, and conceptual overlaps in addition to the demonstration that the Danielic text is the most likely source when compared with other Jewish and Hebrew Bible texts. Mark 9:3 is not considered to be a valid reference because of the lack of correspondence between Mark and Daniel and because the motif of “white garments” is not exclusive to Daniel.²⁹ Mark 13:7 is also an invalid reference to Daniel because of notable grammatical and conceptual differences between the two texts. Although there is a lexical similarity between the two texts in δεῖ γενέσθαι, it was demonstrated that its use in Mark is incompatible on other grounds. In Dan 2:28-29 and 45, ὅ δεῖ γενέσθαι corresponds to “what things will be” which will be revealed to king Nebuchadnezzar. The book of Revelation contains potential allusions to this text because the reference includes the plural relative pronoun ὅ, as

²⁹ See also 1 En 14:20; 71:1; 4 Ezra 2:39, etc.

well as the broader theme of revelation.³⁰ Mark's use of δεῖ γενέσθαι is closer to Matthew's use of the expression in Matt 26:54 where the phrase is used as an idiomatic expression to convey that "something must take place" with no obvious connection to Daniel's use of the expression. For these reasons, Mark 9:3 and 13:7 have been rejected as valid Danielic references based on the criteria outlined above.

However, applying these same criteria, eight of the ten Danielic references in Mark suggested by the NA27 were determined to be genuine Danielic references. Detailed arguments for these decisions have been given in the previous chapter. Mark's references to Daniel can be divided into two categories: those found in Mark 13 and those found in the rest of the gospel.

4.3.1.1 Danielic References in Mark 13

Daniel was a significant source for Mark in composing the apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13, which contains four out of eight of Mark's Danielic references. Here, Beale's hypothesis that Daniel is a midrashic *Vorbild* after which Jewish writers pattern their own writing is especially illuminating.³¹ It can be seen that the eschatological framework of Daniel is especially relevant to the literary setting of Mark 13, which is an extended discussion about the last days³² prompted by Jesus' remarks about the future destruction of the Jewish temple.³³ A. Y. Collins observes that "the destruction of the temple is perceived as part of the sequence of events that constitutes the end or the eschatological turning point when all things will be

³⁰ Rev 1:1; 4:1; 22:6.

³¹ Beale, *Revelation*, 313-20. See also, L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13 par.* (ConBNT 1; Lund: Gleerup, 1966), 207.

³² "In those days" (ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις) in Mark 13:24 has eschatological significance. C.f. Dan 12:1 (LXX: κατὰ τὴν ὥραν ἐκείνην ; Θ: ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ). See also the discussion of "the end" in J. E. Goldingay, *Word Biblical Themes: Daniel* (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1989), 87.

³³ Mark 13:1.

fulfilled (συντελεῖσθαι).³⁴ The Danielic eschatological schema of military conflict, persecution, and the final, decisive intervention of God is retold by Mark in his own narration of the last days. While Mark generally follows Daniel's broader framework, he also inserts various details and elaborations upon Daniel's vision of the end.³⁵ Mark primarily draws upon elements of Dan 12 in the apocalyptic discourse of Jesus in Mark 13. He takes Daniel's exhortation in Dan 12:12 "blessed is the one who endures"³⁶ (LXX: μακάριος ὁ ἐμμένων; Θ: μακάριος ὁ ὑπομένων) and applies it to those who remain faithful to Jesus.³⁷ He takes Daniel's comment about Israel's unprecedented suffering in Dan 12:1, and escalates the severity of the description of the impending calamity.³⁸ In Dan 12:1, the angel tells Daniel that the suffering "in that time" is greater than anything the people of Israel have experienced since the founding of their nation up to that point. In contrast, Mark describes the forthcoming suffering in Judea to be worse than anything that has been experienced "since the beginning of the creation that God created" and will never be experienced again.³⁹ Jesus explains that this calamity will occur when his disciples see "the desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be", employing the Danielic expression τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, which was also familiar to the writer of 1 Maccabees and Josephus.⁴⁰ In Dan 12:11, Daniel also uses τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως as an eschatological temporal marker: "From the time that the regular burnt offering is taken away and the abomination that desolates is set up, there shall

³⁴ A. Y. Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 11.

³⁵ Hence, L. Hartman's contention that Mark 13 is Danielic "midrash". Although he qualifies that what he means is that the elements in Mark 13 are "midrashic" character, and not that Mark 13 is by genre midrash. Hartman, *Prophecy*, 207.

³⁶ Translation mine.

³⁷ Mark 13:13.

³⁸ Mark 13:19.

³⁹ Mark 13:19.

⁴⁰ Mark 13:14.

be one thousand two hundred ninety days.” Daniel’s τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως likely refers to some act of desecration of the temple that is seen as both cataclysmic and symbolic of the distress experienced by Israel. Mark uses the phrase in the same way, possibly expecting the forthcoming tribulation to also be ushered in by a heinous act against the people of God similar to that of the desecration of the Jewish temple under Antiochus IV.

In Dan 12:1, there is mention of the decisive action of God—Daniel’s people “shall be delivered” after the afore-mentioned time of suffering—but few details are given about how it will take place. Mark’s description of the decisive action of God is the climax of his apocalyptic discourse, and he uses various Hebrew Bible scriptures in his elaboration of this event. Instead of Dan 12:1, Mark opts for the vision of the “one like a son of man” in Dan 7 (along with Isa 31:10 and 34:4) to depict the eschatological moment of God’s decisive action. H. C. Kee writes, “The high point of the [Markan] apocalypse comes in the parousia of the Son of Man, whose appearance is linked with Dan.7.13f.”⁴¹ As discussed in the previous chapter, “the Son of Man coming in clouds” in Mark 13:26 positively identifies Jesus as the heavenly messiah figure who will usher in the kingdom of God.⁴² Even though Mark is alluding to Dan 7:13, the heavenly figure is not referred to as Daniel’s ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, but as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (with a definite article preceding both terms). Regardless of the origin of the term or how it is used, the double definite

⁴¹ H. C. Kee, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark’s Gospel* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1977), 45.

⁴² E. K. Broadhead, “Reconfiguring Jesus: The Son of Man in Markan Perspective” in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels*, vol. 1, T. R. Hatina, ed. (New York: T & T Clark International, p. 2006), 25.

form of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Mark refers solely to Jesus.⁴³ In the context of Mark 13, the Son of Man is also understood to be messianic, as evinced by the warnings against those who claim to be the messiah: “And if anyone says to you at that time, ‘Look! Here is the Messiah!’ or ‘Look! There he is!’—do not believe it. False messiahs and false prophets will appear and produce signs and omens, to lead astray, if possible, the elect.”⁴⁴ In his discourse Jesus teaches the disciples to recognize when the true messiah will appear. The expression that the Son of Man will come “with great power and glory” is most likely an interpretation or paraphrase of the immediate context of Dan 7:13, which is the coronation scene of the “one like a son of man”. In the vision of Dan 7, the heavenly man-like figure is given “dominion, glory, and kingship” so that “all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him”.⁴⁵ He is given the dominion that has been taken away from the beasts in Dan 7:12, and his kingdom is described as one that shall never pass away nor be destroyed.⁴⁶

According to these observations, Mark understands the vision of Dan 7 to be closely related to the decisive action of God in Dan 12. However, Dan 7 contains a more expansive description of the decisive moment than Dan 12 in this regard, providing more vivid imagery as well as a fuller picture of the process by which the kingdom of God will be inaugurated. For this reason, although the eschatological framework of Mark 13 is taken from the *Vorbild* of Dan 12, the description of the

⁴³ See L. W. Hurtado, “Summary and Concluding Observations” in *Who Is This Son of Man? The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus*, eds. L. W. Hurtado, P. L. Owen (London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2011), 166-168.

⁴⁴ Mark 13:21-22.

⁴⁵ Dan 7:14a.

⁴⁶ Dan 7:14b.

moment of God's decisive action is portrayed using Dan 7 as well as other non-Danielic scriptures.

4.3.1.2 Danielic References Beyond Mark 13

The NA27 text identifies four references to Daniel outside of Mark 13: Mark 1:15; 4:11, 4:27, and 14:62. Although the references appear infrequently, they occur at crucial points in Mark's narrative, especially as it pertains to the message and identity of the Markan Jesus. Kee, in his study of Mark's use of the Hebrew Bible, claims that "Mark has been influenced directly by Daniel in his representation of the career and intention of Jesus."⁴⁷ Mark 1:15 contains Jesus' introductory proclamation of the kingdom of God at the outset of his preaching ministry. Mark 4:11 and 4:27 are located in Mark's chapter on the subject of Jesus' parables about the kingdom of God. Mark 14:62 contains Jesus' affirmation of his messianic identity in response to the high priest and before the Sanhedrin at the end of his life. Therefore, even though the frequency of the Danielic references appears to be inconsequential, their distribution in Mark's narrative is significant. Danielic references appear at the beginning of his ministry in the chapter relating his parabolic teachings and at the end of his ministry. Furthermore, it has been observed that as the identity of Jesus as messiah is progressively revealed in Mark the reference to the vision of Dan 7 is also gradually expanded. In Mark 8:38, the coming of the Son of Man is mentioned; in Mark 13:26, he is described as "coming in clouds"; and in Mark 14:62, he is "coming with the clouds of heaven".

In addition to the strategic placement of Danielic references across the chronology of Mark's narrative, the content of the references is also significant with

⁴⁷ Kee, *Community*, 45.

regard to Mark's portrayal of Jesus. The proclamation of the kingdom of God in Mark 1:15 introduces and defines Jesus' ministry. The parables of Mark 4 are the way in which Jesus taught the outsiders about the kingdom of God. Jesus' response to the high priest in Mark 14:62 is a public disclosure of his messianic identity. Hence, references to Daniel have some part to play in Jesus' proclamation, in his kingdom parables, and his identity which are all important elements of Mark's portrayal of Jesus.

The reference in Mark 1:15 is to Dan 7:22, Daniel's reiteration of the element concerning the "one like a son of man" in the vision of Dan 7. The actual vision is contained in Dan 7:1-14. Daniel 7:15-28 recounts Daniel's reaction to the vision and his request for an interpretation: "As for me, Daniel, my spirit was troubled within me, and the visions of my head terrified me. I approached one of the attendants to ask him the truth concerning all this. So he said that he would disclose to me the interpretation of the matter..."⁴⁸ In Dan 7:21-22, Daniel inquires about the second half of the vision concerning the judgment of the fourth beast: "As I looked, this horn made war with the holy ones and was prevailing over them, until the Ancient One came; then judgment was given for the holy ones of the Most High, and the time arrived when the holy ones gained possession of the kingdom."⁴⁹ The phrase "and the time arrived when the holy ones gained possession of the kingdom" corresponds to the visionary element of the arrival of the "one like a son of man". Goldingay has warned against equating the "one like a son of man" solely with the people of Israel, noting that "[t]he humanlike figure and the holy ones more likely stand for

⁴⁸ Dan 7:15-16.

⁴⁹ Dan 7:21-22.

supernatural entities who take over authority in the world on God's behalf."⁵⁰ In a similar vein, J. J. Collins considers the "one like a son of man" to be the archangel Michael, who "leads and represents both the heavenly host and their human counterparts, the faithful Jews."⁵¹ M. B. Shepherd's analysis of Dan 7 under the lens of the context of the Hebrew Bible insists that the use of the term "worship" (פִּלַּח) in Dan 7:14 "excludes every interpretation...except the messianic interpretation."⁵² However, apart from Dan 7, each use of פִּלַּח in biblical Aramaic refers to the "worship", "veneration", or "religious service" of either God or pagan deities (Dan 3:12, 14, 17, 18; 6:17, 21; Ezra 7:24).⁵³ The broader meaning of פִּלַּח is "to serve", but there are many reasons from the context of Dan 7 to suggest that the narrower meaning of "to worship" is a better translation. The three elements of the theophanic cloud symbolism, the description of receiving "dominion, glory, and kingdom", and the doxological character of Dan 7:14 ("His dominion is an everlasting dominion that will not pass away, and his kingdom is one that will never be destroyed."), when understood together, comprise an image compatible with the Jewish understanding of God. For this reason, the translation of פִּלַּח as "to worship" is not entirely inconsistent with the textual data.⁵⁴ Shepherd argues that "[n]owhere in the Hebrew Bible do saints (Dan 7:27), prophets, angels, or mythological figures rightly receive

⁵⁰ Goldingay, *Themes*, 90.

⁵¹ J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977), 146. See also N. Schmidt, "The 'Son of Man' in the Book of Daniel," *JBL* 19 (1900): 22-8. Other candidates for the angelic interpretation include Gabriel, a figure representing a multitude of angels, and the chief of God's angels. See also H. Kruse, "Compositio libri Danielis et idea Filii Hominis," *VD* 37 (1959): 193-211; J. Coppens, "Le Fils d'Homme daniélique et les relectures de Dan 7:13 dans les apocryphes et les écrits du Nouveau Testament," *ETL* 37 (1961): 5-51; and Z. Zevit, "The Structure and Individual Elements of Daniel 7," *ZAW* 80 (1968): 385-96.

⁵² M. B. Shepherd, *Daniel in the Context of the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Peter Lang, 2009), 90.

⁵³ A. Lacoque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976), 111-2.

⁵⁴ See a fuller discussion of פִּלַּח in A. J. Ferch, *The Son of Man in Daniel Seven* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979), 167-71.

worship.”⁵⁵ He further maintains that the “one like a son of man” is to be associated with the “expected messianic figure of the future” that has “the status of deity and humanity together”.⁵⁶ Shepherd’s claims that the Danielic “one like a son of man” belongs to the category of deity is corroborated by A. Feuillet who argues that the picture of the cloud imagery of Dan 7:13 is to be understood as divine imagery associated with Yahweh.⁵⁷

Regardless of whom the “one like a son of man” figure in the vision refers to, Dan 7:27 makes clear that the consequence of his receiving kingship is that the kingdom “shall be given to the people of the holy ones of the Most High”. Therefore, Mark’s allusion to Dan 7:22 in Mark 1:15 is a reference to the coming of the kingdom of God. Mark’s Jesus proclaims, “[t]he time is fulfilled [or: has arrived], and the kingdom of God has come near; repent, and believe in the good news.”⁵⁸

Stated in the visionary language of Dan 7, the Markan Jesus announces the tremendous news that the momentous kingdom of God is soon arriving. Understood in the context of the vision of Dan 7, the arrival of the kingdom signifies God’s decisive action in the world, by which the nations will be condemned and their dominion given to the people of God. However, as J. J. Collins observes, “Daniel is not only concerned with world empires and their judgment by God...he also looks beyond the judgment to an eschatological kingdom.”⁵⁹ In line with Collins’ understanding, there are many indications that the kingdom Jesus announces is an eschatological kingdom. Jesus does not primarily engage in political or military

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid. Shepherd cites Isa 9:6 and 10:21 as examples where the future messiah exhibits divine qualities.

⁵⁷ A. Feuillet, “Fils de l’Homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique,” *Revue Biblique* 60 (1953): 189.

⁵⁸ Mark 1:15.

⁵⁹ J. J. Collins, *Apocalyptic*, 162.

conflict (apart from conflicts within Judaism), but proceeds to cast out evil spirits instead. Instead of denouncing the Roman rule, he is more concerned with the forgiveness of sins and the salvation of men.⁶⁰ Apart from a small group of disciples, he does not gather people around himself. Furthermore, Jesus teaches in Mark 9:1 that the kingdom of God “will come in power”, and in the apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13, the coming of the Son of Man is depicted in eschatological terms. Even after Jesus’ death the kingdom had not arrived, Joseph of Arimathea was described as one who was “waiting expectantly for the kingdom of God” (προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ).⁶¹

N. T. Wright has argued that eschatology in Mark does not refer to the end of the world of space and time, but “the climax of Israel’s history, involving events for which end-of-the-world language is the only set of metaphors adequate to express the significance of what will happen, but resulting in a new and quite different phase within space-time history.”⁶² According to Wright, Mark’s introductory kingdom proclamation in Mark 1:15 expresses the claim that “in the unique and unrepeatable career of Jesus Israel’s history had reached its climactic moment.”⁶³

Wright’s proposal is attractive because he understands the apocalyptic language used to describe the kingdom of God in the context of Jewish texts that are known to employ metaphysical imagery to refer to significant and cataclysmic events within history. Wright insists that individual elements of Jesus’ proclamation be understood in the larger context of Israel’s story, noting that “to say ‘the kingdom of god is at hand’ makes sense only when the hearers know ‘the story so far’ and are

⁶⁰ Mark 2:5, 10; 3:28; 8:35; 10:45.

⁶¹ Mark 15:43.

⁶² N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 208. See also R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2002), 500-501.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 227.

waiting for it to be completed.”⁶⁴ Wright’s approach is invaluable because it is not only aware of the historical contexts of biblical texts, but also the ideological and theological contexts that are under the surface of the texts.

The only caveat to Wright’s approach is that because he reads individual texts in light of the ideological or theological grid that he constructs, any inaccuracies or misunderstandings within that grid will be reflected in his reading of the individual texts. In order to fully engage with Wright’s exegesis of individual texts, one must first come to an agreement with his particular set of presuppositions. However, Wright’s analysis of Mark 1:15 provides a reasonable explanation for the eschatological nature of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation. Mark’s allusion to Dan 7:22 places Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom of God in the ideological and theological context of the vision of Dan 7 in which the God of Israel is finally acting to bring an end to the current regimes and establish his rule on earth.

There are two references to Daniel in Mark 4, which contains Jesus’ parables of the kingdom of God. The first reference is found in Mark 4:11 and it alludes to the concept of τὸ μυστήριον found in Dan 2:27-47. In response to the disciples request for an interpretation to the parable of the sower (Mark 4:3-9), Jesus introduces his explanation of the parable with the comment that the “mystery” of the kingdom of God has been given to the disciples whereas “everything comes in parables” to those on the outside (τοῖς ἔξω).⁶⁵ In addition to the similarity of the term τὸ μυστήριον is the fact that the kingdom of God is the subject of τὸ μυστήριον in both texts. In Dan 2:27-47, τὸ μυστήριον refers to Nebuchadnezzar’s dream about the statue that will be destroyed and replaced by a stone that represents the kingdom of God. Beale

⁶⁴ Ibid., 226.

⁶⁵ Mark 4:11.

notes that the element of “the establishment of a divine kingdom” is a particular nuance of “mystery” that can also be observed in other early Jewish texts.⁶⁶

Therefore, even in the context of Daniel, as well as in his early interpreters, there is a connection of the concept of “mystery” and the kingdom of God.

The vision of Dan 2 is also related to the oft-alluded vision of Dan 7. There is a conceptual link between Dan 2 and Dan 7 which is also a revelation concerning a series of kingdoms—the last of which will be followed by the kingdom of God.⁶⁷

Many early Jewish interpreters of Daniel also include “the contextual association of allusions” from Dan 2 and 7, suggesting that they understood both texts to be referring to the same thing.⁶⁸ In Mark 4:11, the mystery of the kingdom of God is contrasted with the parables that Jesus tells the crowds. Similar to Dan 2, in which the king is given a dream by which the kingdom of God is concealed and subsequently revealed via Daniel, Jesus reveals the mystery of the kingdom which has been concealed in his parables to his disciples. In other words, what is being revealed to the disciples is the meaning and significance of the kingdom of God in Jesus’ parabolic teachings.

The second reference to Daniel in Mark 4 is in Jesus’ parable of the mustard seed in Mark 4:32. The main point of the parable is the surprising growth of the kingdom of God, akin to the development of the mustard plant from a tiny and seemingly inconsequential seed into a large bush that provides shelter for birds. The Danielic reference is to the description of the tree in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in Dan 4:9 and 18. The image of a tree with large branches in which “the birds of the air”

⁶⁶ Beale, *Revelation*, 324.

⁶⁷ Goldingay, *Themes*, 2.

⁶⁸ Beale, *Revelation*, 325.

can nest represents the glory and might of Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom.⁶⁹ It has been noted in the analysis of this reference in the previous chapter that the magnificence of the Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom itself was not condemned by God, but his pride and his failure to acknowledge God were condemned. In the narrative of Dan 4, the kingdom is eventually restored to Nebuchadnezzar after he repents of his pride, saying,

At that time my reason returned to me; and my majesty and splendor were restored to me for the glory of my kingdom. My counsellors and my lords sought me out, I was reestablished over my kingdom, and still more greatness was added to me.⁷⁰

Therefore, the imagery of the magnificent tree to describe a glorious kingdom does not necessarily have negative connotations; in fact, after Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom is restored to him it becomes even greater. The vivid language using the image of a tree to describe a powerful kingdom is employed in Mark's parable of the mustard seed to refer to the future, glorious state of the kingdom of God. The image in Mark is particularly striking because the starting point of the kingdom is compared to a mustard seed, which is described as "the smallest of all the seeds on earth".⁷¹

The reference to Daniel in Mark 14:62 is to the element of the coming of the "one like a son of man" in the vision of Dan 7. The reference appears in Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin when he replies to the high priest's question about his messianic identity. Jesus answers in the affirmative and alludes to both Dan 7:13 and Psalm 110:1. It has been discussed above that the significance of the use of Dan 7:13 must be understood together with the allusion to Psalm 110:1 as well as in the context of the high priest's question. For Mark, the allusion to the two scriptures has

⁶⁹ Dan 4:9, 18.

⁷⁰ Dan 4:36.

⁷¹ Mark 4:31.

three functions. It affirms the messianic status of Jesus. Shepherd writes, “[i]t is simply noteworthy that the prevailing interpretation [of the “one like a son of man”] at the time of Jesus and the New Testament authors was the messianic interpretation”.⁷² It predicts the future exaltation of Jesus as the heavenly Son of Man. This is articulated in no uncertain terms, as the figure “coming with the clouds of heaven” is Mark’s articular expression of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου which only refers to Jesus. As some scholars maintain,⁷³ it is a challenge to his opponents. The ones who are now judging him will in turn be judged when the Son of Man comes.⁷⁴

The allusion to Dan 7:13 in Mark 14:62 not only speaks to Jesus’ identity as messiah and the exalted Son of Man, it also refers to the climactic moment of the coming of the kingdom of God that Jesus has been proclaiming throughout Mark’s gospel. Wright has observed that “there is a good deal of implicit christology within kingdom-language”,⁷⁵ and it may well be that implicit in Markan messianic language (i.e., the “one like a son of man” coming in clouds, the description of the anointed in Psalm 110) there may also be references to the kingdom as well. Similarly, Jens Schröter contends that “the decisive designation with which the claim that Jesus is the representative of the βασιλεία is expressed in ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.”⁷⁶ In fact, Marcus also observes that Dan 7 belongs to a network of Old Testament texts (Zech 9-14; Dan 7; Ps 22; Isa 40-55) alluded to in the Markan Passion that “all have strong traditional connections with the notion of the kingdom of God.”⁷⁷ Each of these

⁷² Shepherd, *Context*, 91.

⁷³ M. D. Hooker, *Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 365.

⁷⁴ Marcus, *The Way of the Lord. Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992) 196.

⁷⁵ Wright, *Jesus*, 222.

⁷⁶ J. Schröter, “The Son of Man as the Representative of God’s Kingdom: On the Interpretation of Jesus in Mark and Q,” in Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt (eds.), *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 54.

⁷⁷ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 202.

commentators would agree that Mark not only borrows the apocalyptic and visionary language of Dan 7, but is appropriating the context of Daniel, including its concepts and clusters of images, to create new significance for his readers.⁷⁸

By observing all of the Danielic references in Mark at a glance, a pattern of Mark's usage of Daniel emerges. In the apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13, the common thread that connects the Danielic references is that they all fall under the eschatological framework of Dan 12, using it as a *Vorbild* and inserting in it original paraenetic material. The sequence of eschatological events in Mark 13 follows the same sequence that is observed in Dan 12: military conflict, a calamity for the Jewish people, and the decisive action of God. Mark 13:26 also alludes to Dan 7:13-14, but this reference should be seen as a vivid elaboration on the momentous occasion of the decisive action of God.

The overarching commonality between the Daniel references outside of Mark 13 is the theme of the kingdom of God as presented in the book of Daniel.⁷⁹

Although the vision of Dan 7 is the primary text that is alluded to, other texts related to the theme of kingdom are also used. Daniel 7:22, which is alluded to in Mark 1:15, is a re-iteration of Dan 7:13. The vision of Daniel 2, which is alluded to in Mark 4, is a vision of the kingdom of God and is closely related to Dan 7.⁸⁰ The image of a tree that is used to describe Nebuchadnezzar's splendid kingdom in Dan 4, is also used to illustrate the future success of the kingdom of God in Mark 4:32. And finally, the reference to Dan 7:13 in Mark 14:62 alludes to the coming of the kingdom of God, when Jesus' opponents will see him exalted and vindicated as messiah. It can be seen that Mark's use of Daniel is far from random and that outside

⁷⁸ See Broadhead, "Reconfiguring", 18.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 21-22.

⁸⁰ Goldingay, *Themes*, 2.

of Mark 13, he primarily employs Danielic references that are associated with the Danielic theme of the kingdom.

4.3.2. The Overall Functions of Markan Use of Daniel

What are the literary functions of the various Danielic references in Mark? Firstly, all of the Danielic references analyzed in the present study occur in the form of direct speech, and more significantly, they only occur on the lips of Jesus. Evaluating whether these sayings are authentic to Jesus is beyond the scope of this dissertation; however, it can be said that certain parts of the book of Daniel are clearly influential in the proclamation and teachings of the Markan Jesus. The Danielic references are not used by the narrator to describe or interpret any particular event in the style of the *pesharim* of contemporary Jewish literature, nor are they employed programmatically,⁸¹ nor do they influence the structure of Mark's narrative.⁸² Nor can it be stated that Daniel is "the most formative influence" in the thought and structure of Mark, as Beale contends it to be for Revelation.⁸³ Rather it is clear from Mark's use of Daniel in combination with other scriptures (i.e. in both Mark 13:26 and 14:62) that Daniel is but one of many sources that influences from the Old Testament. Be that as it may, Daniel remains an important source of inspiration for Mark, as demonstrated by the fact that references to Daniel are only used in the direct speeches of Jesus, particularly those that communicate his message and

⁸¹ I.e., The reference to Isaiah and Malachi in 1:2 is seen by some to be a programmatic text. See R. E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997), 370.

⁸² Kee argues that "Mark has been influenced directly by Daniel in his representation of the career and intention of Jesus" on the basis that like Daniel, Mark begins "with miracles stories, and moving through the issue of martyrdom, to personal and cosmic revelations." However, Kee's argument is to be rejected because the events in Mark do not fall neatly into the pattern he notes. E.g. The healing of blind Bartimaeus occurs in Mark 10, *after* Kee's category of "martyrdom" and "personal revelations". See Kee, *Community*, 45.

⁸³ Beale, *Revelation*, 297.

identity. Mark's restricted use of Daniel to convey the message of Jesus is a significant feature of his *modus operandi*.

It has been observed that none of Mark's references to Daniel are explicit references. They are not preceded by a citation-formula to alert the reader that a reference is taking place,⁸⁴ but are embedded directly into the speech of Jesus without warning. Indeed, some of these references are more oblique and considerable space has been devoted to determining their validity in the previous chapter. However, it has also been observed that the references in question do have remarkable similarities with the Danielic text, and it has also been shown they in all likelihood they do not come from some other early Jewish or Hebrew Bible source. G. K. Beale, in his study of the use of Daniel in the book of Revelation has noted the difficulty in determining whether an author "(1) is consciously alluding to an O.T. text, (2) is making an unconscious reference via his 'learned past', (3) is merely using stock apocalyptic phraseology, or (4)...[is] referring to an actual experience which has parallels with an O.T. text."⁸⁵ Given the high degree of contextual awareness that has been demonstrated in Mark's use of Daniel in the analyses of the previous chapter, Beale's first category of the conscious allusion makes the best sense of the evidence that we have seen. Although Mark's references to Daniel are fragmentary, that is, they only hint at one or two elements of the source-text, the reference is only effective if the audience is familiar with the larger context of the reference. For example, the NA27 considers Mark 13:26 to be a direct quotation of Dan 7:13. However, the only elements of the vision of Dan 7 that are quoted are "coming" (ἐρχόμενον) and "in clouds" (ἐν νεφέλαις). The form of the "Son of

⁸⁴ Mark employs some sort of citation-formula to indicate his references to Isaiah (Mark 1:2; 7:6; 11:17), Jeremiah (Mark 11:17), the Psalms (Mark 12:36) and Zechariah (Mark 14:27).

⁸⁵ Beale, *Revelation*, 306.

Man” is not even the same as the quoted text in either LXX or Θ: ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου. The reference to the same Danielic text in Mark 14:62 resembles the source-text (Θ) more closely using a more exact quotation of the element of the clouds: μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. However, even with the more exact quotation of Daniel in Mark 14:62, the only elements of the vision mentioned are the coming of a figure with the clouds, which are obscure details unless one is already familiar with the vision. The Markan addition that the Son of Man will come with great power and glory (μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης) is an elaboration of the Danielic scene of the exaltation and coronation of the “one like a son of man”. The question of the high priest regarding Jesus’ messianic identity in Mark 14:62 anticipates Jesus’ reply, which pertains precisely to his vindication as messiah. Therefore, in order for the references to Dan 7:13 to have any meaning, the audience needs to recall the larger context of the allusion and supply the necessary details assumed by the author.

The use of the Danielic references in Mark 13 also presupposes the audience’s knowledge of the eschatological schema of Dan 12.⁸⁶ The significance of Mark 13 is not the eschatological framework itself, but the way in which Mark has adapted it for his audience. In Mark 13, it is not those who remain faithful to the Jewish customs that will be saved, but those who endure because of the name of Jesus.⁸⁷ The calamity to take place in Judea is far greater than even that which is described in Dan 12.⁸⁸ The heavenly figure who will usher in the decisive action of

⁸⁶ The use of the expression τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως in 1 Maccabees and Josephus attest to this phenomenon.

⁸⁷ Mark 13:13.

⁸⁸ Mark 13:19.

God is none other than Jesus, the Son of Man.⁸⁹ Therefore, Mark's innovative interpretation of Dan 12 plays against what is already known about the end times. Mark's purpose in adapting Daniel's eschatological framework is to temper eschatological speculations in his audience and to articulate a christological interpretation of Daniel's prophecies.

Furthermore, the conclusion that Mark consciously alludes to Daniel can also be reached by observing the aggregate of evidence of Mark's use of Daniel. Beale notes that "if the same kind of reference appears among a cluster of other clearer allusions to the O.T. context in question, then the degree of probability increases."⁹⁰ As noted above, the constellation of references to Dan 12 in Mark 13 is an indicator that conscious allusions are being made. The repeated use of the vision of Dan 7 (Mark 1:15; 13:26; 14:62) also suggests that they are conscious allusions, meaning that perhaps even texts with more oblique references are also allusive to Dan 7.⁹¹ Even the reference to Dan 2 in Mark 4:11 is related to the vision of 7 because the mystery that is revealed is that of the kingdom of God in both Mark and Daniel. The reference to the kingdom tree of Dan 4 is different to the rest of the references because it belongs neither to the visions of Dan 7 or 12. However, even this reference appears to be a conscious allusion because three different elements of the vision of the tree are recounted: the large branches, the "birds of the air" that make their home in the tree, and the shade of the tree.⁹² It is possible that this reference belongs to Beale's third category, that the author "is merely using stock apocalyptic

⁸⁹ Mark 13:26.

⁹⁰ Beale, *Revelation*, 307.

⁹¹ I.e. Mark 8:38.

⁹² Mark 4:32.

phraseology”;⁹³ however, the category must be expanded to include stock descriptive imagery of a kingdom. The cumulative force of the various Danielic references, some of which are more obvious than others, compels the interpreter to conclude that Mark was inclined to make conscious allusions to Daniel, not only in wording or phrase but also in his adoption of Daniel’s descriptive imagery and the larger narrative and theological contexts of his visions.

4.3.2.1. Danielic References in Mark 13

As with the analysis of the contours of Danielic references, their literary functions can also be divided into those within the apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13, and those outwith Mark 13. The Danielic references in Mark 13 all have a similar literary function. They provide the eschatological framework upon which Mark hangs the details of his own understanding of the end of days, with Jesus at its centre. A. Y. Collins defines apocalypse to mean the

the genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an other worldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another, supernatural world; such a work is intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority.⁹⁴

Collins’ definition of apocalypse fits well with the vision of Dan 12; however, the discourse of Mark 13 is better seen as an interpretation of Dan 12 with apocalyptic elements. The revelation is not given by “an other worldly being” but by Jesus. Apart from the more cryptic descriptions of the coming of the Son of Man in Mark 13:24-27, Jesus speaks plainly about the forthcoming events in “earthly” language.

⁹³ Beale, *Revelation*, 306.

⁹⁴ A. Y. Collins, *Cosmology*, 7.

However, there is the sense that the events Jesus describes belong to a progression of significant events leading up to a climactic conclusion. Therefore, Daniel 12 functions as the eschatological framework or *Vorbild* that Mark relies on to compose his discourse.

4.3.2.2. *Danielic References Beyond Mark 13*

Beyond Mark 13, the literary functions of the Markan references to Daniel are variously associated with the Markan theme of the kingdom of God. The function of the reference to Dan 7:22 in Mark 1:15 is to situate Jesus' kingdom proclamation at the precipice of the eschatological *καίρὸς* of Dan 7, when God's reign will finally be established. *καίρὸς* does not refer to just any decisive moment, but to the time envisioned in Dan 7 when the kingdom will be given to "the people of the holy ones of the Most High". Dan 7:22 provides the ideological context behind Jesus' introductory kingdom proclamation. The function of the Danielic reference in Mark 4:11 is to compare the revelation of the meaning of Jesus' parabolic teachings to the revelation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream about the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God in both texts is a *μυστήριον* that can only be "perceived by divinely granted interpretation".⁹⁵ The function of the reference to Daniel in Mark 4:32 is to illustrate the future splendour of the kingdom of God with the image of a tree that sustains animal life. Mark not only employs Danielic wording and phraseology, but moreover, the entire metaphor of a tree for a kingdom. The function of the reference to Dan 7:13 in Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin is to simultaneously affirm the messianic identity of Jesus (the double articular use of the expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* identifies Jesus with the messianic heavenly figure), and to proclaim the coming

⁹⁵ Kee, *Community*, 47.

of the kingdom when his opponents will see him vindicated as such. Marcus states that Mark “makes the motif of the kingdom of God of central importance and binds it intimately to the notion of the kingship of the Messiah”.⁹⁶ The vision of Dan 7, especially its portrayal of the kingly “one like a son of man”, is an especially significant text used to develop and enhance Mark’s formulation of these ideas.

4.4. Conclusion

The influence of Daniel on Mark has previously been acknowledged, but the present study has traced the extent and shape of that influence by examining the particular contours and functions of Danielic references in Mark, as well as the cumulative force of these references.⁹⁷ Of the ten references to Daniel acknowledged by the NA27 text, eight of the references (Mark 1:15; 4:11; 4:32; 13:13; 13:14; 13:19; 13:26; 14:62) have been found to be valid references under the criteria imposed by the present study. These references are made without the use of any citation-formulas and mostly depend on a text similar to Θ rather than the LXX. Mark understood Daniel to be scripture, as is evidenced by his literary technique of combining Danielic references with other scriptures. Mark’s Danielic references only occur in the direct speech of Jesus, suggesting that the text of Daniel may have been influential to Mark’s understanding and portrayal of Jesus’ intention and identity. Mark’s references to Daniel are also found in significant points in Mark’s narrative—the beginning of Jesus’ ministry, the parables of Jesus, Jesus’ teachings on eschatology, and Jesus before the Sanhedrin—and primarily pertain to the Markan theme of the kingdom of God. Mark’s use of Daniel in the apocalyptic discourse of

⁹⁶ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 202.

⁹⁷ Refer to Fig. 21 in Ch. 3 of this thesis for an outline of the findings, 235.

Mark 13 is unique to the rest of the gospel. In Mark 13, repeated references to Dan 12 are made, suggesting that Mark relies heavily on the eschatological framework of Dan 12 for his own composition. The overarching commonality between the Danielic references that appear outside of Mark 13 is their relation to the kingdom of God. Mark employs Daniel to proclaim the kingdom (Mark 1:15), to describe the kingdom (Mark 4:32), and to identify Jesus as the glorious representative of the kingdom (Mark 14:62). If these findings are valid, George Nickelsburg's contention that "[i]n spite of the frequent use of Danielic language and imagery, these [New Testament] texts, with the exception of Revelation, do not emphasize the Danielic motif of 'kingship', much less an eternal reign"⁹⁸ might need to be partially revised to include Mark amongst New Testament works that emphasize the Danielic kingdom of God.

The cumulative force of studying and aggregating individual references to Daniel compels the interpreter to observe the broader patterns of Mark's use of Daniel. That is, apart from the references in Mark 13 which have an eschatological focus, Mark's *modus operandi* for using Daniel is to provide the theological and ideological background to Jesus' message of the kingdom of God. Mark intends for his audience to understand Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God in the context of the decisive action of God as it is developed in the dreams and visions of Dan 2, 7, and 12. Mark's dependence on Danielic references to shape his own theme of the kingdom of God is not a feature that can be easily observed by studying individual references. And indeed, Beale warns that it is also possible that "authors were not conscious of modelling their works on Daniel, but that the models are a result of a tradition or an unconscious element in the writers' minds from their learned past."⁹⁹

⁹⁸ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 312.

⁹⁹ Beale, *Revelation*, 317.

However, when all of the references are analyzed together, it can be seen that the contours and functions of each Markan reference to Daniel outside of Mark 13 pertain to the theme of the kingdom of God. This implies that Mark's selection and employment of Danielic kingdom references is likely to be an intentional, and even strategic, literary technique.

Mark's dependence on Daniel should be understood in the context of the literary tendencies of other early Jewish writers, whose reverence for the Danielic tradition did not prevent them from adapting the Danielic text and re-interpreting it with new insight. It is clear that Mark did not simply export ideas from the Danielic text; he also imported new ideas into Daniel. The central focus in Mark's gospel is not the kingdom of God, but the figure of Jesus. For this reason, even though the theological and ideological context of Daniel is used to shape Mark's story about Jesus, Mark is simultaneously interpreting Daniel in light of what he knows about Jesus. The most striking display of this inter-relationship is where Mark alludes to Dan 7:13 in Mark 13:26 and 14:62 but replaces the "one like a son of man" with Jesus' self-referential title in the gospel, the "Son of Man". This simple change reflects a fundamental and interpretive redaction on the part of Mark, who is at the same time alluding to a scriptural tradition and re-interpreting it with his own understanding of the figure of Jesus. This very reason accounts for the continuity, discontinuity, and ingenuity that can be observed in the Danielic references appearing in the Gospel of Mark.

4.5. Implications of the Study and Suggestions for Further Study

In conclusion, a few final comments will be offered regarding the implications of the current study, as well as some suggestions for further study. The NA27 and UBS4's list of Danielic references may need to be revised. Based on a close reading of the texts identified by the NA27 to contain Danielic references, two out of the ten texts were deemed unlikely to contain Danielic references based on the criteria of the present study. On the other hand, the UBS4 text only identifies four Danielic references, omitting important references to Daniel—most notably the reference in Mark 1:15 to Dan 7:22. Furthermore, the NA27's classifications of direct quotation and definite allusion may need to be re-evaluated because it is often not clear why one reference is considered a definite allusion and another reference a direct quotation.

Also, Philipp Vielhauer's contention that the kingdom of God and Son of Man are totally distinct and separate elements in the traditions related to Jesus¹⁰⁰ should also be reconsidered in light of the findings of the current study. It has been observed that Mark primarily draws upon Daniel to develop his kingdom of God theme. It has also been seen that Jesus is clearly identified to be the "one like a son of man" figure. In Markan texts that "directly quote" Dan 7:13, the Son of Man is not a simple quotation but already includes an editorial redaction of the "one like a son of man" to the articular form that refers to Jesus. Furthermore, this study has demonstrated that references to Dan 7:13 also invoke the larger of context of the kingdom of God. The most salient example in favour of this suggestion is found in Mark 8:38--9:1, a passage where Mark combines the motifs of the Son of Man

¹⁰⁰ P. Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu in der Verkündigung Jesu," in *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (Munich: Kaiser, 1965), 51-59.

coming “in the glory of his father with the angels” and “the kingdom of God coming in power”. R. Rowe’s contentions that Mark “linked the concept of Messiahship/divine sonship with the kingdom of God” and that the Son of Man is related to the Messiah agree with the Markan interpretation demonstrated in this study.¹⁰¹ Therefore, considering the textual evidence, it is unlikely the two traditions are completely unrelated.

In this study Mark’s *modus operandi* in using Daniel was observed by the exegetical study of specific references, followed by an analysis of these references *in toto*. A similar approach can also be used to ascertain the pattern of Mark’s use of other Hebrew Bible scriptures, such as Isaiah or the Psalms. Alternatively, a fruitful line of enquiry would be to apply the same approach to the gospels of Matthew and Luke so as to reveal the contours and functions of Danielic references in those texts.

¹⁰¹ R. Rowe, *Kingdom*, 305-9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lexical Resources

A Greek-English Lexicon, 9th edition with a Revised Supplement, ed. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 3rd ed., ed. W. Bauer, W. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon, ed. F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.

Primary Sources

“1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” trans. E. Isaac, in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, 1.21, 49. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, 4th ed., eds. K. Elliger, W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.

Josephus: Jewish Antiquities, Books IX-XI, trans. R. Marcus. Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Novum Testamentum Graece, 27th ed., eds. E. Nestle, K. Aland, et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblestiftung, 1993.

Qumran Cave 4. XIVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3, published by J. J. Collins, P. W. Flint, consulting ed. J. VanderKam. DJD 22. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes, ed. A. Ralphs, 2 vols. in 1. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.

Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum, vol. XVI, pars 2, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*, editio secunda, ed. J. Ziegler. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New English Translation, eds. M. O. Wise, M. G. Abegg, Jr., E. M. Cook. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, rev. 2005.

The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English, ed. F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version with Apocrypha, ed. B. Metzger. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

The Greek New Testament. 4th ed., ed. B. Aland et al. United Bible Societies. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1993.

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments, vol. 1, ed. J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Secondary Sources

Alomía, M. "Cómo Es Usado Daniel En Marcos," *Theologika* 16 no. 1 (2001): 2-30.

Ambrozic, A. M. "Mark's Concept of the Parable: Mark 4:11f in the Context of the Second Gospel," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 220-227.

Anderson, H. "The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays. Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, ed. J. M. Efird, 280-306. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972.

Anderson, J. C., Moore, S. D., eds. *Mark & Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

Baird, J. A. "A Pragmatic Approach to Parable Exegesis: Some New Evidence on Mark 4 11, 33-34," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957), 201-7.

Bartlett, J. R. *1 Maccabees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Barr, J. *Escaping from Fundamentalism*. London: SCM Press, 1984.

Basser, H. W. *Studies in Exegesis: Christian Critiques of Jewish Law and Rabbinic Responses, 70-300 CE*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Beale, G. K. *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature in the Revelation of St. John*. Lanham, MD: University Press, 1984.

- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986.
- . “The Vision on the Mount: The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13,” *Ex Auditu* 6 (1990): 39-52.
- Bilde, P. “Josephus and Jewish Apocalypticism” in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives*, ed. S. Mason, 35-61. JSPSup 32; Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Bock, D. L., Herrick, G. J. *Jesus in Context: Background Readings for Gospel Study*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.
- Boring, M. E. *Mark. A Commentary*. The New Testament Library. Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.
- Bowman, J. *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah*. Studia postbiblica 8. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Boyer, J. “The Classification of Participles: A Statistical Study,” *Grace Theological Journal* 5.2 (1984): 163-79.
- Broadhead, E. K. “Reconfiguring Jesus: The Son of Man in Markan Perspective” in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels, vol. 1*, ed. T. R. Hatina, 18-30. New York: T & T Clark International, 2006.
- Brooke, G. J. *Exegesis at Qumran 4QFlorilegium and Its Jewish Context*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Brown, R. E. *The Semitic Background of the Term “Mystery” in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Brown, S. “The Secret of the Kingdom of God” (Mark 4:11) *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, no. 1 (1973): 60-74.
- Bruce, F. F. “Josephus and Daniel”, *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* (1965): 48-62.
- Burkett, D. R. *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Cadbury, H. J. *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*. New York: Macmillan, 1937; reprinted 1973.

- Carey, J. J. "Apocalypticism as Bridge between the Testaments," in *The Old and New Testaments: Their Relationship and The "Intertestamental" Literature*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth and W. P. Weaver, 89-105. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993.
- Carrington, P. *Primitive Christian Calendar: A Study in the Making of the Marcan Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- Casey, M. "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 7 (1976): 11-29.
- . *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- . *The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem*. Library of New Testament Studies. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Charlesworth, J. H. "Pseudepigrapha, OT" in Vol. 5 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 537-40. New York, Doubleday, 1992.
- Chilton, B., ed. *The Kingdom of God*. London: SPK; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Chronis, H. L. "To Reveal and to Conceal: A Literary-Critical Perspective on 'the Son of Man' in Mark," *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005): 459-81.
- Collins, A. Y. *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*. HDR 9. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press; Harvard Theological Review, 1976.
- . "The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13" in *The Four Gospels, FSF*. Neirynck; ed. F. Van Segbroeck, et al., 1125-1140. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- . "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," in *Daniel*, J. J. Collins, 90-123. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . "The Apocalyptic Rhetoric of Mark 13 in Historical Context," *Biblical Research* 41 (1996): 5-36.
- . *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *Mark. A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Collins, J. J. *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

- . “Sibylline Oracles” in Vol. 6 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 2-6. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . “The Son of Man in First Century Judaism,” *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 448-66.
- . “Prayer of Nabonidus” in Vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 976. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . *Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eedrmans, 1998.
- . “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, Vol. 2, ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, 403-430. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Coppens, J. “Le Fils d’Homme daniélique et les relectures de Dan 7:13 dans les apocryphes et les écrits du Nouveau Testament,” *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 37 (1961): 5-51.
- Cousar, C. B. “Eschatology and Mark’s Theologia Crucis: A Critical Analysis of Mark 13,” *Interpretation* 24 (1970): 321-335.
- Cross, F. M. “The Structure of the Apocalypse of ‘Son of God’ (4Q246)” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman, W. W. Fields, 151-8. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Crossley, J. G. *The Date of Mark’s Gospel. Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity*. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Culpepper, R. A. *Mark*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2007.
- Crossan, J. D. “The Seed Parables of Jesus,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 244-66.
- Croy, N. C. *3 Maccabees*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Derrett, J. D. M. *The Making of Mark: The Scriptural Bases of the Earliest Gospels*, 2 vols. Shipston-on-Stour, UK: Drinkwater, 1985.
- De Boer, P. A. H. “The Son of God in the Old Testament,” *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 18 (1973): 188-201.
- De Silva, D. A. *4 Maccabees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Nisbet & Co, 1952.
- . *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Duling, D. C. "Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven" in Vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 49-69. New York, Doubleday, 1992.
- Dunn, J. D. G. "The Danielic Son of Man in the New Testament," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception*, vol. 2, ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, 528-49. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Ennulat, A. *Die "Minor Agreements": Untersuchungen zu einer offenen Frage des syntischen Problems*. WUNT 2:62. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Evans C. A., Talmon, S., eds. *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Biblical Interpretation Series 28. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception*, vol. 2, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint, 490-527. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . "How Mark Writes," in *The Written Gospel*, ed. M. Bockmuehl and D. A. Hagner, 135-148. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . "The Beginning of the Good News and the Fulfillment of Scripture in the Gospel of Mark," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. S. E. Porter, 83-103. Grand Rapids; Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2006.
- Farrer, A. M. *A Study in Mark*. Westminster: Dacre, 1951.
- Feuillet, A. "Fils de l'Homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique," *Revue biblique* 60 (1953): 170-202, 321-46.
- Ferch, A. J. *The Son of Man in Daniel Seven*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979.
- Fischer, T. "Books of Maccabees" in in Vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 435-49. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Fitzmyer, J. *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- . "4Q246: 'The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," *Biblica* 74 (1993): 153-174.

- Flint, P. W. "The Daniel Tradition in Qumran" in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 2, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint, 329-67. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Flusser, D. "The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran," *Immanuel* 10 (1980), 31-7.
- Foster, P. "Polymorphic Christology," *Journal of Theological Studies* 58 (2007): 66-99.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Funk, R. W. "The Looking-Glass Tree Is for the Birds: Ezekiel 17:22-24; Mark 4:30-32," *Interpretation* 27 (1973): 3-9.
- García Martínez, F. *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. New York: Brill, 1992.
- Goldingay, J. E. *Word Biblical Themes: Daniel*. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1989.
- Grabbe, L. "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, Part 4. *Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection & the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*, ed. A. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner, 163-85. *Handbuch der Orientalistik: Erste Abteilung, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten* 17; Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "A Dan(iel) For All Seasons" in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol 2., ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint, 236-44. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Grassi, J. A. "Child, Children" in Vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 904-7. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Goulder, M. D. *The Evangelists Calendar*. London: SPCK, 1978.
- Guelich, R. A. "The Beginning of the Gospel," *Biblical Research* 27 (1982): 5-15.
- Hare, D. R. A. *The Son of Man Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Hartman, L. *Prophecy interpreted. The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par*. *Coniectanea biblica, New Testament* 1. Lund: Gleerup, 1966.
- Hays, R. B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1989.

- Heil, J. P. *The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-36*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2000.
- Hooker, M. D. "Mark," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, Ssf.*, ed. D. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, 220-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- . *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and its Use in Mark's Gospel*. London: SPCK; Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, updated 2009.
- Hurtado, L. W. *Lord Jesus Christ. Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2003.
- . "Summary and Concluding Observations" in *'Who Is This Son of Man?' The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus*, eds. L. W. Hurtado, P. L. Owen, 159-177. London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2011.
- Jacob, I., Jacob, W. "Flora" in Vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 803-17. New York, Doubleday, 1992.
- Jeremias, J. *The Parables of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- Kee, H. C. "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," in *Jesus and Paulus*, ed. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer, 165-85. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- . *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1977.
- Knibb, M. A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Koester, H. *Ancient Christian Gospels. Their History and Development*. Philadelphia: Trinity; London: SCM, 1990.
- Kruse, H. "Compositio libri Danielis et idea Filii Hominis," *Verbum domini* 37 (1959): 193-211.
- Kümmel, W. G. *Promise and Fulfillment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- Laquoque, A. *The Book of Daniel*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1976.
- Lindars, B. *Jesus Son of Man*. London: SPCK, 1983.

- Lose, D. J. "What Does This Mean? A Four-Part Exercise in Reading Mark 9:2-9 (Transfiguration)," *Word & World* 23 (2003): 85-93.
- Mack, B. L. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Marcus, J. *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986.
- . "'The time has been fulfilled!' (Mark 1.15)" in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards, 49-68. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 24. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- . *The Way of the Lord. Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992.
- Marshall, I. H. *The Gospel of Luke: A commentary on the Greek text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- . *The Origins of New Testament Christology*. 2nd ed. Downer's Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1990.
- . *New Testament Theology. Many witnesses, one gospel*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2004.
- McComiskey, D. S. "Exile and the Purpose of Jesus' Parables (Mark 4:10-12; Matt 13:10-17; Luke 8:9-10)," *Journal of The Evangelical Theological Society* 51 (2008): 59-86.
- Mertens, A. *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*. Stuttgarter biblische Monographien 12. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971.
- Meyer, M. W. "Mystery Religions" in Vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 941-4. New York, Doubleday, 1992.
- Milik, J. T. "'Priere de Nabonide' et autres ecrits d'un cycle de Daniel," *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956): 407-15.
- . "Les modèles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *Revue de Qumrân* 15 (1992): 383-4.
- Montgomery, J. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1927.
- Müller, M. *Der Ausdruck 'Menschensohn' im den Evangelien*. Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- . *The Expression 'Son of Man' and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation*. London; Oakville: Equinox Publishing, 2008.

- Müller, P. "Zwischen dem Gekommenen und dem Kommenden. Intertextuelle Aspekte der Menschensohnaussagen im Markusevangelium" in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn*, ed. Dieter Sänger, 130-57. Biblisch-theologischer Studien 67. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004.
- Mussner, F. "Gottesherrschaft und Sendung Jesu nach Mk 1, 14f. Zfugleich ein Beitrag über die innere Struktur des Markusevangelium" in *Praesentia Salutis. Gesammelte Studien zu Fragen und Themen des Neuen Testaments*, 81-98. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1967.
- Moule, C. F. D. *The Origins of Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Moyise, S. *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*. The Continuum Biblical Studies Series. New York: Continuum, 2001.
- . *Jesus and Scripture. Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- . "First Book of Enoch" in Vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 508-516. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . "The Son of Man in Judaism and Early Christianity," in *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism. Expanded Ed.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Perkins, P. "Mark 4:30-34," *Interpretation* (2002): 311-313.
- Perrin, N. *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom*. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- . "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *New Testament Studies* 18 (1972): 243-67.
- . *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- . *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Piper, O. "Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New Testament," *Interpretation* 11 (1957): 3-22.
- Porter, S. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology" In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, edited by C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, 79-96. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

- Puech, E. "Fragment d'une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le 'Royaume de Dieu'," *Revue biblique* 99 (1992): 98-131.
- Rosner, B. S. *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Roth, W. *Hebrew Gospel: Cracking the Code of Mark*. Oak Park, IL: Meyer-Stone, 1988.
- Rowe, R. D. "Is Daniel's 'son of man' messianic?" in *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology presented to Donald Guthrie*, ed. H. Rowdon (1982), 71-96. Downers Grove: IVP, 1982.
- . *God's Kingdom and God's Son. The Background to Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Schellenberg, R. S. "The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71 (2009): 527-43.
- Schiffman, L. H. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994.
- Schlosser, J. *La Règne de Dieu dans les dits de Jésus*, 2 vols. Ébib. Paris: Gabalda, 1980.
- Schmidt, N. "The 'Son of Man' in the Book of Daniel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 19 (1900): 22-8.
- Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and Kingdom*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Schneck, R. *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VII*. BIBAL Dissertation Series 1. Vallejo, CA: BIBAL Press, 1994.
- Schröter, J. "Jesus, der Menschensohn. Zum Ansatz der Christologie in Markus und Q", in idem, *Jesus und die Anfänge der Christologie. Methodologische und exegetische Studien zu den Ursprüngen des christlichen Glaubens*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.
- . "The Son of Man as the Representative of God's Kingdom: On the Interpretation of Jesus in Mark and Q", in *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records*, ed. Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt, 34-68. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 200.
- Swartley, W. M. "The Structural Function of the Term 'Way' (Hodos) in Mark's Gospel," in *The New Way of Jesus: Essays Presented to Howard Charles*, ed. W. Klassen, 73-86. Kansas: Faith and Life Press, 1980.

- Schulz, S. "Markus Und Des Alte Testament," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 58 (1961): 184-97.
- Scott, B. B. *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Shepherd, M. B. "Daniel 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man," *Westminster Theological Journal* 68 no. 1 (2006): 99-111.
- . *Daniel in the Context of the Hebrew Bible*. New York: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Silva, M. "Old Testament in Paul," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, 631-4. Downers Grove, Inter-varsity Press, 1993.
- Smith, D. M., Jr. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays. Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, ed. J. M. Efird, 25-30. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972.
- Stanley, C. D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Studies for New Testament Monograph Series 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Stein, R. H. "Is the Transfiguration a Misplaced Resurrection-Account?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95:1 (1976): 79-96.
- Stegemann, H. "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik" in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, ed. D. Hellholm, 495-530. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Stone, M. E. *Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Sundberg, A. C. "On Testimonies," *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1959): 268-81.
- . "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method" in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel. Investigation and Proposals*, ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, 45-58. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Stein, R. H. *The Synoptic Problem*. Grand Rapids, Baker, 1994.
- Suhl, A. *Die Funktion Der Alttestamentlichen Zitate Und Anspielungen Im Markusevangelium*. Gütersloher: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1965.
- Thompson, M. *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 59. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1991.

- Tödt, H. E. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
- Turner, N. "Style" in Vol. 4 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ed. J. H. Moulton, et al, 11-30. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1976.
- Vielhauer, P. "Gottesreich Und Menschensohn in Der Verkündigung Jesu," in *Aufsätze Zum Neuen Testament*, 55-91. Munich: Kaiser, 1965.
- Volz, P. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1934.
- Von Lengerke, C. *Das Buch Daniel. Verdeutscht und ausgelegt*. Königsberg: Bornträger, 1835.
- Vorster, W. S. "The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark," *Neotestamentica* 14 (1981): 62-72.
- Wallace, D. B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Watts, R. E. *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997.
- Wenham, D. "The Kingdom of God and Daniel." *Expository Times* 98 (1987): 132-4.
- . "Abomination of Desolations" in Vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, 28-34. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Willet, T. W. *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1989.
- Willis, W., ed. *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987.
- Witherington, B., III. "Transfigured Understanding: A Critical Note on Mark 9:2-13 as a Parousia View," *Ashland Theological Journal* 24 (1992): 88-91.
- Wright, N. T. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- . *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Zevit, Z. "The Structure and Individual Elements of Daniel 7," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 80 (1968): 385-96.